A

TREATISE

OF

Justifying Righteousnes,

In Two Books:

I. A Treatise of *Imputed Righteousness*, opening and, defending the True Sense, and confuting the False, with many of Dr. *Tullies* Reasonings against *Truth*, *Peace*, and *Me*: With an Answer to Dr. *Tullies* Letter, adjoyned:

II. A Friendly Debate with the Learned and Worthy Mr. *Christopher Cartwright*, containing:

1. His Animadversions on my Aphorisms, with my Answer.
2. His Exceptions against that Answer.
3. My Reply to the Summe of the Controversies agitated in those Exceptions.

All Published instead of a fuller Answer to the Assaults in Dr. *Tullies Justificatio Paulina*, for the quieting of Censorious and Dividing Contenders, who raise odious Reports of their Brethren as *Popish*, &c. who do but attempt Reconcilingly to open this Doctrine more clearly than themselves.

By *Richard Baxter*.

LONDON, Printed for *Nevil Simons* and *Jonath. Robinson*, at the Princes-Arms and Golden-Lion in St. *Pauls* Church-Yard, 1676.



305:04

To the Readers; especially all Faithful Ministers of Christ in *England*.

MY endeavours to save Men from the Libertine (*called* Antinomian) *Errors, having led me to a distincter handling of* some Points, *than I had before found in the Authors I had read; and my first* Conceptions *of them* (*expressed in a small Book, called* Aphorismes, *&c.*) *being yet* crude *and* defective, *for want of* Time, *and* use of Writing (*which as the Lord* Bacon *saith,* must make Men accurate) *that being* my First, *some suspected it of* Error *in Doctrine, some of* Novelty, *and some only of divers* undigested Expressions, *and some* over-valuing it, *received those Imperfections with the rest: Whereupon publishing my desire of my Friends Animadversions, I received* (*as I have else-where with Thanks acknowledged*) *such as were very learned, judicious, and friendly; of which those of Mr.* Lawson, *Dr.* Wallis, *Mr.* Jo. Warren, *and Mr.* Ch. Cartwright, *were the chief; by which if I had not very much profited, I had been very dull. Of*

these One *spake so agreeably to my Thoughts,* (*Dr.* W.) *that I had nothing but* Thanks *to return him: And the rest having shewed me the Incongruity of some Expressions, and the crudity of some Passages, received friendly my Answers in the little Matters that we differed in, which were rather about the* Aptness of Notions, *than the* Truth of Matter. *None of these were intended for Publick view, nor on* my part *were fit for it; for I wrote but in order to my further Learning. But at last, my Friend, Mr.* Sound, *who interceded between us for Communication of Papers, made me think, that Mr.* Cartwright *was not willing, that so large Pains, as he had taken, should be so buried: But I could not return him his* Exceptions *as he desired, because they were lost, (and I had no mind to be very inquisitive after them, in order to a Publick view) But some years after his death, they were found again.*

Being somewhat clearer in those Matters by all these Helps *and* Studies, *I published my* Suspension of the Aphorisms, *and my* Explication *and* Defence *of their Doctrine in my Confession, and my fuller Explication and defence in my* Apologie, *and* Disputations of Justification, *protesting against them, that would take the* Suspended Book *for my* Cleared-sense *without the* Confession. *To all these I remember no Answer that I have had, save some-what of Dr.* Owens (*Dr.* Kendales *and many others, were on other Accounts; and Mr.* Crandons, Eyres, &c. *were to the Aphorisms before: so that twenty years Silence made me think my Brethren pretty well satisfied, and the great fall of* Antinomianism *made me think that my Labour had not been in vain. But lately Dr.* Tully *in a Book called* Justificatio Paulina *hath Written, as you may see.*

Since

Since all these Books, and in twenty fours years time (from the first) my conceptions of these Matters (unless I were very stupid) must needs be much ripened and ordered: I better discern what Notions are to be left out, and what Method is to be used as most apt for true Elucidation; I more discern than heretofore, how much of the Controversie is real, and how much verbal, which Le Blank *and* G. Forbes *have usefully opened, besides many others; and which in my* Cathol. Theol. *I have partly shewed, and more exactly in a* Methodus Theologiæ *not Printed: It was therefore many ways a trouble to me, that Dr.* Tully *should fall upon the* Aphorisms *without taking notice of any of the foresaid* Explications *or* Defences; *much more that he did it* in such a manner.

Supposing that a particular Answer to all his Words would be but useless to do a little *of that, which I had fuller done before, having returned here so much as I thought necessary, I have published my* Papers and Mr. Cartwrights *instead of the rest: And I have given you* entirely Mr. Cartwrights last, *though I answer but the Summe of them, so far as we differ, meerly lest I should wrong the Dead, by suppressing so learned and elaborate a Treatise, which I think he desired should not be suppressed. And if any think that he is* unanswered, *I leave them to profit by what-ever they shall find in him, which they think is against me, and passed by. He was a very Learned, Peaceable, Godly Man, known by his Rabbinical Commentary, and his* Defence *of King* Charles I. *against the Marquess of* Worcester, *Successor to Mr* W. Fenner *in the* Staffordshire *Lecture against* Popery, *and after Minister in* York: *You may see that his acquaintance with* Protestant Writers *was very great, whose steps in ex-*

pres-

preſſions he was loth to leave, however he went not with the part that was for the Imputation of the Active Righteouſneſs *and freely differeth in ſome other things.*

The firſt piece [of Imputed Righteouſneſs] *was written haſtily on another occaſion about three or four years ago: But for the brevity of the argumentative part was caſt by, with an intent to perfect it if I had time: Which being never like to have, upon this renewed aſſault from Dr.* Tully, *I thought it beſt to let it go as it is; this* latter part *which anſwereth* him *being newly annexed; as alſo the* Anſwer *to his angry Letter.*

My ſtrait is very great in dealing with this worthy Man: It grieveth me unfeignedly to diſhonour or grieve him: But had his Book been as much againſt my Perſon only, *and as little touched the* Doctrine *and* Intereſt *of the Church, as Biſhop* Morley's *againſt me did (to whom he dedicateth it) perhaps Self-denyal had commanded me ſilently to bear all, for the ſake of Peace. But where* Truth, Love *and* Peace *are jointly intereſted, Reſpect to Man will not warrant me to deſert them: And it greatly troubleth me that his* Words *are ſuch, as cannot be* truly opened and anſwered *as they* are, *without ſomewhat which will diſpleaſe: And Guilt is tender, and Self-love ſtrong, and few Men judg of their own cauſe and words, as they would do of anothers; but if I have let fall any where any* ſuch words *as* his Letter *hath* many, *or if I repeat the* [Inſanis, deliras, &c.] *as oft as* Beza *did againſt* Illyricus, *or uſe ſuch words as* Calvin *did againſt* Baldwin, *or as other ſuch Perſons have ordinarily uſed, with whom I am not worthy to be named, and who are deſervedly honoured by him and me, when I find them, I ſhall* repent *of them, and I deſire him*

that

that seeth any unwarrantable Sharpneſs, which I see not, not to imitate it; but in judging ſtill to obſerve the Neceſſity of the Cauſe. *Though I lay not the Churches Concord and Mens Salvation upon* Logical *Definitions and Methods; yet I take* Method, *and* well-interpreted apt Names and Notions *to be of very great uſe to our clear diſtinct underſtanding of the Matter, and I fear no Cenſure more from my Brethren, than of* Over-doing *in that part: And I oft wonder at my ſelf, to find how I grow more and more in Love, both with the* Primitive ſimplicity, *and with* accurateneſs of Notions *and* Method, *which ſeem to ſome to be contrary. But I find that it is the* former *that I more and more value, as our* Bread and Drink, our Food and Work, *which muſt principally take up* Mind *and* Life, *and be the* Matter and Means *of our* Peace *with* our ſelves *and* one another, *our* comfort in Life and Death, *and the terms of the* Churches Peace and Concord, *if ever we ſhall ſee ſuch a bleſſed day, and be delivered from proud unreaſonable Men. And it is principally for* Ornament, *and* greater Clearneſs, *and the* ending *of many* Controverſies, *and the* perfecting *of our Minds with a* delightful uſeful higher *knowledg, and the more skilful managing ſacred things, that I value and deſire the* latter. *And while we agree in the former, I can differ from any in the latter, with a* Salvo *to Chriſtian Love and Peace.*

If this worthy Perſon be over-angry with me, it is my duty to ſee that I deſerve it not, and that I be not over-angry with him: Alas, the opening of each others Ignorance is a ſmall part of our ſuffering from one another here. (Nay why is it not our gain, and matter of thanks, if Pride *and* Selfiſhneſs *prevail*

not: And if they do, alas, we have greater evils to lament!) If I cannot love those, that have endeavoured utterly to ruine me in the World, and taken from me more than Food and Rayment, even as much as in them lieth, thirteen years of my most mature and useful Age, wo unto me; for my want of love to Enemies will hurt me a thousand fold more than their most implacable Malice. Far then be it from us, to be cast into any Passions unbeseeming Brethren, by the different conceptions of sincere Men.

I know that it is my duty, as much as in me lieth, to live peaceably with all Men: But if God have called me to call the Militant Clergie from those Contentions, which for many Ages have been the sin and misery of the Churches, and hath intrusted me with any reconciling Means, *which have a special aptitude to quench the Flames, to clear up Truth, and recover Love and Christian Concord, I must not be false to such a trust, because some mistaking Oppofers are displeased: If it be I that have plunged my self needlesly into a Controversie, which I am really a stranger to, and then in the pride of my heart am angry with him, who discovereth my Ignorance and Temerity, I beseech you freely call me to repentance: But if any other be most confident, where they most err, or are least acquainted, we are not for their sakes to wrong the Church: That Truth and Falshood, Good and Evil, should go under* right Characters, *and that Mens conceptions of them be* just such *as* they are, *is a matter of great importance to the World: It is a sort of* false Doctrine, *to represent* false Doctrine *(for the Persons sake)* less hurtful *or* monstrous *than it is: And if Men will take the detection of the deformity of their faults and errors, to be a* Dishonour *and* Injury *to* themselves,

who

who can help it? and who can save Men from themſelves, *or preſerve his honour, who will maculate it himſelf?*

I take it to be no ſmall advantage to many doubting Readers, that (for all the heat) the two firſt Controverſies *raiſed by this worthy Perſon (of* our Guilt of Parents ſin, *and of my Rule for* preferring *the judgment of thoſe that God hath moſt illuminated in caſes of difficulty) have had ſo good an iſſue: For who will now* diſſent, *when* he conſenteth, *who ſought to raiſe in Men ſuch apprehenſions of ſome dreadful danger? Nothing ſtands ſo ſafe, as that which is firm after the greateſt aſſaults. If the ſtrongeſt Winds overthrow not the Houſe, it is not like to fall by leſs. And I hope this will be finally the iſſue of the reſt.*

One thing I am aſhamed of, but cannot help, viz. *That in this and all my Writings, the ſame things are ſo oft repeated: But it is partly for want of time to be duly accurate, and more becauſe Mens renewed Importunity calleth for it (taking all as unſaid, which was ſaid before), and chiefly becauſe that the* Communication *of uſeful Truth is my* end, *and I find that a* few words *will not ſerve with moſt; and that is the beſt* Means, *which beſt attaineth the* End: *And if* all together *procure a due reception, I have what I deſired, it being not the* Perfection *of a* Book, *or the Authors honour which I intend, but the edification of the Reader; to* whoſe Capacity, *as well as to the* Matter, *we muſt fit our words.*

If any think that I ſhould have recited all the Doctors words *which I confute, I tell him, that I ſuppoſe him to have the Book it ſelf before him; and that I doubt I have already been too long.*

I have been long employed in Controverſie, while I write

write against unnecessary Controversies; but it hath been to end them, *either by* removing the Mistakes *which* continue *them, or by shewing Men that see it not*, how far Contenders are agreed. *I profess my self one who (distinguishing of REAL and SIGNAL or ORGANICAL Knowledg) do take* Words *to be so far useful as they help us to know* Things, *and to* communicate *that knowledg; and therefore value* Words *but as* adapted *to* Things *and* Minds: *And I have but low thoughts of that Knowledg which reacheth no further than Words, or that which extendeth (or pretendeth) to* Things *by no other medium than* Words; *in comparison of that which perceiveth them as in* themselves, *or at least in their* likeness, *or* effects. *And therefore though I would have* Words *improved to the best advantage for Knowledg, I am so deeply sensible of the great imperfection of Mankind in the* Art *of Speaking, as that I greatly abhor the laying too much of the* Peace *of* Souls *or* Churches there-upon, *and making* Words *and* forms *of* Speech, *the engins of Cruelty or Division: (And I have long perceived too many forreign Criticks and Grammarians to have been (like* Paracelsians *in Physick) more* proud *and* boasting *far than the worth of their Learning would justifie, and to have too much vilified the School-Mens sort of Learning, (which was more real than most of theirs) while they rose up against their barbarous words) But whether (if* Words *in this Controversie must needs be more regarded than I have said) it be* my sayings, *or those that I* write against, *which have need of* this charitable Cover, *I leave you to judg,* 1. *By the Consequences of the unsound sense of Imputation hereafter opened.* 2. *And by this Catalogue of some of the Doctrines which I have long gain-said, viz.*

1. *That*

I. *That the Perſon of the Mediator was* Legally *or in* Gods account *the very* Perſon *of every ſingle elect Sinner (even before that Sinner was a Perſon).*

II. *That every ſuch Sinner (before he was) did in Law-ſenſe, or in Gods reputation, perfectly fulfil all Gods Law in and by Chriſt.*

III. *And therefore the Law of Innocency doth juſtifie him as fulfilling it by another, and as an innocent Perſon, as from his firſt Being to his Death.*

IV. *That the ſame Perſon did himſelf Reputatively or in Law-ſenſe, ſuffer in and by Chriſt, all the puniſhment due to him as a ſinner, by the Threatning of the Law of Innocency, or of any Law of God; and that the Law did repute him both* Innocent *as fulfilling it by another, and a Sinner as breaking it himſelf.*

V. *That therefore no Elect perſon ſuffereth* any Puniſhment *in his own perſon.*

VI. *And that our ſins were ſo imputed to Chriſt, as that he was accounted of God really a ſinner, taking to him the* Reatum culpæ & non tantum pœnæ, vel Culpæ ſolum quo ad pœnam: *And ſo that he had* really *as much* Guilt *of ſin it ſelf as all the Elect; and was in* true Guilt *the worſt Perſon that ever was in the World.*

VII. *That he was accordingly hated of God, as the worſt guilty ſinner.*

VIII. *That he ſuffered the ſame pains of Hell which we deſerved, (viz. Torment of an accuſing Conſcience privation of Gods Love and Spirit, under ſin, &c.)*

IX. *That* his Righteouſneſs *was not only a fulfilling of the Law* as it obliged him, *and his* Suffering, *the tranſlated puniſhment of ſinners* due to him by Aſſumption *and by the* Law *which impoſed it on him; but the one was the* perfect fulfilling of all Gods

Gods Law, as it obliged every Elect person; *and the other the perfect fulfilling of the threatning of Gods Law, as* it threatned the Persons of all the Elect.

X. *That therefore Christs suffering was not* satisfaction to the Law-giver *instead of the said* fulfilling of the Law, *but the fulfilling it self by us in Christ.*

XI. *That therefore every Elect person (say some) or every Believer (say others) is as Righteous as Christ was, by that perfect fulfilling of the Law; all his Righteousness being* ours it self as full proprietors, *because of our union with him; and not only* ours *in* Causality, *as meriting and procuring us Righteousness and Life.*

XII. *That therefore Justification and Righteousness is perfect at the first Instant.*

XIII. *That this Righteousness of Christ so imputed to us, as wholly our own in it self, is imputed to us as* OUR SOLE RIGHTEOUSNESS.

XIV. *That* Faith *is not imputed to us for Righteousness.*

XV. *That Christ is the only Person covenanted with by God: Or that it is the same Covenant and Law which is made with and for Christ, and which is made with and for us.*

XVI. *That we are not Justified by Faith in God the Father, or in the Holy Ghost.*

XVII. *That we are not Justified by believing in Christ as Christ intirely, or as our Teacher, Owner, King, Judg, or Intercessor in Heaven, nor by any of these, but only by* that Act *of* Faith, which receiveth his Righteousness as imputed to us.

XVIII. *That this* Receiving Act *is but* one in Specie Physica *(say some): but whether* Assent, *or* Consent, *or* Affiance, *and to what* one sole Verity

or

or Object, *is not agreed, and what Faculty it must be in, and whether in* one *or* two, *and how* one Act *can be in* two *Faculties* &c.) *yea (say others) it is but* one Individual Act, *because we are justified perfectly* simul & semel, *and so we are justified by a Faith of* one moment *only.*

XIX. *That believing in God the* Father, *or the* Holy Ghost, *and in* Christ as Teacher, &c. *and all* Faith in Christ, *save the* receiving his imputed Righteousness, *as also* Repentance, desiring Christ, confessing our unrighteousness, praying for Pardon, for the Spirit, for Heaven, hearing the Word, thankfulness for Christ, &c. *are all of them, those WORKS which St.* Paul *opposeth to* Faith *as to Justification: And therefore he that looketh to be justified by any of these, falleth from Grace by expecting Justification by Works.*

XX. *Therefore all Christians, who will be sure that they trust not to Works, and fall not from Grace, must know (among a multitude of Acts, which* [believing in Christ as Christ] *doth contain)* which *ONE* it is *that justifieth: (Which yet I never met with two Divines that agree in the exact description of).*

XXI. *That this ONE Justifying Act, doth justifie only as an Instrument, even the instrumental efficient Cause of our Justification.*

XXII. *That to expect Justification by that ONE Act of Faith under any other notion than that of* such an Instrument, *is to expect Justification by Works, even by* Faith as a Work, *and to fall from Grace.*

XXIII. *That we shall be judged at the great Day only by the* Law of Works, *as* fulfilled by Christ *for the* Elect *and not for Reprobates; and not by the* Law of Grace, *as* fulfilled *or* not fulfilled *by* our selves,

as

as it prescribeth the conditions of Life and Death.

XXIV. *That the Acts or Habits of Faith, Repentance, Love, Obedience, or any part of our fulfilling the conditions of Life in the Gospel, called commonly* our Inherent Righteousness, *are no part of the Matter of* any true Evangelical Justification: *That is, that either we* need no Justification *against the charge of* Infidelity, Impenitency, Rebellions, Unholiness, Hypocrisie; *or if we do, we are not to be justified against these particular Charges by* our Faith, Repentance, Obedience, Holiness, *and* Sincerity.

XXV. *That our said Graces, Holiness and Obedience, have no other use as to our Justification at Judgment, but as* Signs *of the* Instrumental *Act of* Faith, *proving it to our selves and others: And this is* [to be Judged according to our works].

XXVI. *That (though our* Jus ad impunitatem & ad Gloriam *be our Righteousness, (*in part *at least,) and* our Justification at Judgment *be the* justifying that Right, *yet) though Holiness, Obedience, and Perseverance, be* Conditions *of our* Glorification, *they are no* Conditions *of our* final Justification, *or* right to Glory.

These are the Opinions, this is part of the Body of Notional *Divinity, which I have written against these twenty eight years, besides the rest of grosser Antinomianism described in my Confession. And I am confident that this honest Doctor having neither mind nor leisure to see what it is indeed that I am doing, was (some-how) induced to take a snatch, where he thought by a short view he saw advantage, and to write against he knew not* whom or what.

If you ask, what that Doctrine is, that I set up instead of this, I must not still repeat: I refer you to a brief

brief ſum of it in the Preface to my Diſputation of Juſtification.

Or in a very few words, it may ſuffice plain Men to hold, 1. *That Chriſt in the Perſon of a Mediator, hath by his perfect Holineſs and Obedience, and as a ſatisfactory Sacrifice for Sin,* Merited a Free-Gift of Himſelf as our Head, *and of* Pardon, Spirit *and* Glory *with and by Him; and as our* Interceſſor, *our* Owner *and* Ruler, *doth communicate what he merited.*

2. *That he hath made a* Covenant and Law of Grace *to be his* Donative *(and Condonative) Act and Inſtrument, which is our* Title *to the* given Benefits; *(or our* Fundamentum Juris.

3. *That this* Law and Covenant *preſcribeth a* Condition *of the ſaid* Right, *to be performed by our ſelves by the help of Grace (which is our* Conditio Juris).

4. *That this* Condition *is our* Faith, *or* Chriſtianity, *as it is meant by Chriſt in the Baptiſmal Covenant,* viz. *To* give up our ſelves in Covenant believingly to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; *renouncing the contraries.*

5. *That though* true Conſent *to this Chriſtian Covenant (called* Faith alone*) be the* full Condition *of our* firſt Right *to the benefits of that Covenant, (of which* Juſtification *is one) yet* Obediential *performance of the Covenant, and Conqueſt of temptations and Perſeverance, are* Secondary parts *of the condition of our Right as* continued *and* conſummate.

6. *That our Righteouſneſs, which muſt be the Matter of our full and final Juſtification, hath theſe parts,* 1. *Chriſts perfect* Righteouſneſs *and* Sacrifice, *as the* Meritorious Cauſe *of the* Free-Gift: 2. *Our* Right to Impunity *and* Glory *(and the Spirit) as being the*

Righ-

Righteousneſs given. 3. *And our* ſincere performance of the Conditions of Juſtification and Life, *as being a* neceſſary ſubordinate Righteouſneſs.

7. *That becauſe Chriſt will come in Judgment, not to* judg Himſelf, but us, *and will judg us* according to the Law of Grace, *as performers or not performers of his preſcribed conditions of Pardon and Life, therefore his* Righteouſneſs *and* free *conditional Donation being preſuppoſed, the Scripture throughout deſcribeth the laſt Judgment as judging* (*that is, Juſtifying or Condemning*) *Men according to our* (*Evangelical*) *Works, or Preparations, and calleth us to* Care and prepare *accordingly: I conclude with the words of our worthy and great Divines.*

Dr. Preſton *of the Attributes, pag.* 72. [No Man believes Juſtification by Chriſt, but his Faith is mainly grounded on this Word of God: For in Scripture we find that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the Fleſh, and that he is a Lamb ſlain for the Forgiveneſs of Sins: That he is offered to every Creature: That a Man muſt thirſt after him, and then take up his Croſs and follow him. Now come to a Believer going out of the World, and ask him, what hope he hath to be ſaved: He will be ready to ſay, I know that Chriſt is come into the World, and offered up, and I know that I am one of them that have a part in Him: I know that I have fulfilled the Conditions, as that I ſhould not continue willingly in any known ſin, that I ſhould love the Lord Jeſus, and deſire to ſerve Him above all: I know that I have fulfilled theſe Conditions; and for all this, I have the Word for my ground, *&c.*

Id. Tract. of Faith, pag. 44, 45. If I ſhould define Juſtifying Faith to you, it muſt be thus deſcribed; It is a grace or habit, infuſed into the Soul, whereby we are enabled to believe, not only that the Meſſiah is offered to us, but alſo to take and receive Him as a Lord and Saviour, that is, both to be ſaved by Him, and obey Him, *Vid. cat.*

But I have cited enough ſuch elſe-where. ſee Dr. Field's *Append. to the* 3*d Book of the Church, and* Muſculus *on* Gen. 22. 16. *pag.* 530. *and* Gen. 15. 6. *pag.* 352.

The Lord forgive our Weakneſs, and teach his Miniſters the way of Peace, and make them as skilful in reconciling, as they have been in dividing.

OF THE IMPUTATION OF Christ's Righteousness TO BELIEVERS:

In what sence sound Protestants hold it; And,

Of the false devised sence, by which Libertines subvert the Gospel.

With an Answer to some common Objections, especially of Dr. *Thomas Tully*, whose *Justif. Paulina* occasioneth the publication of this.

By RICHARD BAXTER;

A compassionate Lamenter of the Churches wounds, caused by hasty judging and undigested conceptions, and by the Theological Wars which are hereby raised and managed; by perswading the World that meer verbal or notional Differences are *material*, and such as our Faith, Love, Concord and Communion must be measured by, for want of an exact discussion of the ambiguity of words.

London, Printed for *Nevil Simons* and *Jonathan Robinson*, at the Kings-Arms and Golden-Lion in St. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1675.

307 : 04

The Preface.

Reader,

IF thou blame me for writing again, on a Subject which I have written on ſo oft, and ſo lately (ſpecially in my *Life of Faith*, and Diſputations of Juſtification) I ſhall not blame thee for ſo doing; but I ſhall excuſe my ſelf by telling thee my reaſons. 1. The occaſion is many loud accuſations of my ſelf, of which I have before given an account. I publiſh it, becauſe I ſee the Contention ſtill ſo hot in the Church of Chriſt, and mens Charity deſtroyed againſt each other; one ſide calling the other *Socinians*, and the other *Libertines*, (who are neither of them *Chriſtians*) and if I miſtake not, for the moſt part in the dark about *one Phraſe*, and that of mens deviſing, rather than about the ſence: But if indeed it be the ſence that they differ about, it's time to do our beſt to rectifie ſuch Fundamental Errours.

I find that all of us agree in all the Phraſes of Scripture. And a Mans Sence is no way known but by his expreſſions: The

queſtion is then, Which is the *neceſſary Phraſe* which we muſt expreſs our ſence by? We all ſay that to Believers, *Chriſt is made our Righteouſneſs; We are made the Righteouſneſs of God in him; He hath ranſomed, redeemed us, as a Sacrifice for our ſins, a price; He hath merited and obtained eternal Redemption for us, that Sin is remitted, covered, not imputed; that Righteouſneſs is Reckoned or Imputed to us; that Faith is Imputed to us for Righteouſneſs,* and any thing elſe that is in the Scripture. But all this will not ſerve to make us Chriſtians! What is wanting? Why, we muſt ſay that *Chriſts Righteouſneſs is Imputed to us as ours, and that Chriſt ſatisfied for our ſins!* Well; The thing ſignified ſeemeth to us true and good and needful, (though the Scripture hath as good words for it as any of us can invent.) We conſent therefore to uſe theſe Phraſes, ſo be it you put no falſe and wicked ſence on them by *other words* of your own: Though we will not allow them to be *neceſſary*, becauſe not in Scripture; (And we are more againſt adding new Fundamental Articles of Faith to the Scripture, than againſt adding new Orders, Forms or Ceremonies). But yet it will not ſerve: what is yet wanting? why, we muſt hold theſe words in a right ſenſe! What? yet are not your own deviſed

words

words a ſufficient expreſſion of the matter! When we have opened *thoſe words* by *other words*, how will you know that we uſe thoſe *other words* in a right ſence, and *ſo in infinitum.* Our ſence is, that *Righteouſneſs is Imputed to us, that is, we are accounted Righteous, becauſe for the Merits of Chriſts total fulfilling the Conditions of his Mediatorial Covenant with the Father, by his Habitual Holineſs, his Actual Perfect Obedience, and his Sacrifice, or ſatisfactory Suffering for our ſins in our ſtead, freely without any merit or Conditional act of mans, God hath made an Act of Oblivion and Deed of Gift, pardoning all ſin, juſtifying and adopting and giving Right to the Spirit and Life eternally to every one that believingly accepteth Chriſt and the Gifts with and by and from him. And when we accept them they are all ours by virtue of this purchaſed Covenant-Gift.* This is our ſhort and plain explication. But yet this will not ſerve: Chriſtianity is yet another thing. What is wanting? Why, we muſt ſay, that *Chriſt was habitually and actually perfectly Holy and Obedient, Imputatively in our particular Perſons, and that each one of us did perfectly fulfil that Law which requireth perfect Habits and Acts in and by Chriſt imputatively. and yet did alſo in and by him ſuffer our ſelves Imputatively for not fulfilling it. and*

Imputatively did our ſelves both ſatisfy God's Juſtice and merit Heaven; and that we have our ſelves Imputatively a Righteouſneſs of perfect Holineſs and Obedience as ſinleſs, and muſt be juſtified by the Law of Innocency, or Works, as having our ſelves imputatively fulfilled it in Chriſt; And that this is our ſole Righteouſneſs; and that Faith it ſelf is not imputed to us for Righteouſneſs, no not a meer particular ſubordinate Righteouſneſs, anſwering the Conditional part of the new Juſtifying Covenant, as neceſſary to our participation of Chriſt, and his freely given Righteouſneſs. And muſt all this go into our Chriſtianity! But where is it written? who deviſed it? was it in the ancient Creeds and Baptiſm? Or known in the Church for five thouſand years from the Creation? I profeſs I take the Pope to be no more to be blamed for making a new Church-Government, than for making us ſo many new Articles of Faith: And I will not juſtifie thoſe that Symbolize with him, or imitate him in either.

But yet many of the men that do this, are good men in other reſpects: and I love their *zeal* that doth all this evil, *as it is for God* and the *honour of Jeſus Chriſt*, though I love it not as blind, nor their Errour or their Evil. But how hard is it to know what Spirit we are of! But it is the doleful miſ-

miſchief which their blind zeal doth, that maketh me ſpeak; That three or four of them have made it their practice to back-bite my ſelf, and tell People, *He holdeth dangerous opinions; He is erroneous in the point of Juſtification. And his Books are unſound and have dangerous Doctrines; He leaveth the old way of Juſtification, he favoureth Socinianiſm,* and ſuch-like: this is a ſmall matter comparatively. Back-biting and *falſe reports,* are the ordinary fruits of *bitter contentious Zeal,* and the Spirit of a *Sect* as ſuch doth uſually ſo work (yea to confuſion and every evil work,) when it hath baniſhed the *Zeal* of Love and of Good Works. *Jam.* 3. 14, 15, 16. *Tit.* 2. 14. And I never counted it any great loſs to their followers, that they diſſwade them from the reading of my writings (as the Papiſts do their Proſelytes) as long as God hath bleſt our Land with ſo many better.

But there are other effects that command me once again to ſpeak to them. 1. One is, that I have good proof of the lamentable Scandal of ſome very hopeful Perſons of quality, who by hearing ſuch language from theſe men, have bin ready to turn away from Religion, and ſay, If they thus ſet againſt and condemn one another, away with them all.

2. Becauſe divers great Volumes and other ſad Evidence tells me that by their invented ſence of Imputation, they have tempted many Learned men to deny Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs abſolutely, and bitterly revile it as a moſt Libertine Irreligious Doctrine.

3. But above all, that they do ſo exceedingly confirm the Papiſts. I muſt profeſs that *beſides carnal Intereſt and the ſnare of ill Education*, I do not think that there is any thing in the World that *maketh or hardneth* and *confirmeth* Papiſts more, and *hindreth* their reception of the Truth, than theſe ſame well-meaning people that are moſt zealous againſt them, by two means: 1. One by *Diviſions* and *unruline ſs* in Church-reſpects, by which they perſwade men, eſpecially Rulers, that without ſuch a Center as the Papacy, there will be no Union, and without ſuch *Violence* as theirs, there will be no Rule and Order. Thus one extreme doth breed and feed another. 2. The other is by this unſound ſence of the Doctrine of *Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs*, (*with an unſound Deſcription of Faith*) ſaying that every man is to believe it as Gods word (or *fide divinâ*) that his own ſins are pardoned; which when the Papiſts read (that, theſe men make it one of the chief Points of our difference from *Rome*,)

Rome,) doth occaſion them to triumph and reproach us, and confidently diſſent from us in all the reſt. I find in my ſelf that my full certainty that they err in Tranſubſtantiation and ſome other points, doth greatly reſolve me to neglect them at leaſt, or ſuſpect them in the reſt which ſeem more dubious. And when the Papiſts find men moſt *groſly erring* in the very point where they lay the main ſtreſs of the difference, who can expect otherwiſe, but that this ſhould make them deſpiſe and caſt away our Books, and take us as men ſelf-condemned and already vanquiſhed, and diſpute with us with the prejudice as we do with an *Arrian* or *Socinian*? They themſelves that caſt away *our Books* becauſe *they diſſent from us*, may feel in themſelves what the *Papiſts* are like to do on this temptation.

4. And it is not to be diſregarded, that many private perſons not ſtudied in theſe points, are led away by the Authority of theſe men (for more than *Papiſts* believe as the Church believeth) to ſpeak evil of the Truth, and ſinfully to Backbite and Slander thoſe Teachers, whom they hear others ſlander: and to ſpeak evil of the things which they know not. And to ſee Gods own Servants ſeduced into *Diſaffection* and *abuſe* and *falſe Speeches* againſt thoſe Miniſters

ſters that do moſt clearly tell them the truth, is a thing not ſilently to be cheriſhed by any that are valuers of *Love* and *Concord* among Chriſtians, and of the *Truth* and their *Brethrens Souls*, and that are diſpleaſed with that which the Devil is moſt pleaſed and God diſpleaſed with. Theſe are my Reaſons, ſubmitted to every Readers Cenſure; which may be as various as their Capacities, Intereſts or Prejudices.

My Arguments in the third Chapter I have but briefly and haſtily mentioned, as dealing with the lovers of naked Truth, who will not refuſe it when they ſee it in its ſelf-evidence. But they that deſire larger proof, may find enough in Mr. *Gataker* and Mr. *Wotton de Reconcil.* and in *John Goodwin* of *Juſtification*, (If they can read him without prejudice). From whom yet I differ in the Meritorious Cauſe of our Juſtification, and take in the habitual and actual Holineſs of Chriſt as well as his Sufferings, and equal in Merits; and think that *pardon it ſelf* is *merited* by his *Obedience* as well as by his *Satisfaction*: To ſay nothing of ſome of his too harſh expreſſions, about the Imputation of Faith, and non-imputation of Chriſts Obedience, which yet in ſome explications he mollifyeth, and ſheweth that his ſence is the ſame with theirs that place all our Righteouſneſs

in

in remiſſion of Sin; ſuch as (beſides thoſe after-mentioned) are *Muſculus*, *Chamier*, and abundance more: And when one ſaith that *Faith* is *taken* properly, and another that it is taken Relatively in Imputation, they ſeem to mean the ſame thing: For Faith properly taken is eſſentiated by its *Object*; And what *Chriſt's* Office is, and what *Faith's* Office is, I find almoſt all Proteſtants are agreed in ſence, while they differ in the manner of expreſſion, except there be a real difference in this point *of ſimple Perſonating us in his perfect Holineſs*, and making the *Perſon of a Mediator* to contain *eſſentially in ſenſu Civili the very Perſon of every elect ſinner, and every ſuch one to have verily been and done, in ſenſu civili, what Chriſt was and did.*

I much marvel to find that with moſt the Imputation of *Satisfaction* is ſaid to be for *Remiſſion of the penalty*, and Imputation of *perfect Holineſs* for the obtaining of the *Reward Eternal Life*; and yet that the far greater part of them that go that way ſay, that *Imputation of all Chriſts Righteouſneſs goeth firſt as the Cauſe, and Remiſſion of Sin followeth as the Effect*: So even Mr. *Roborough* pag. 55. and others. Which ſeemeth to me to have this Sence, as if God ſaid to a Believer, [*I do repute thee to have perfectly fulfilled the Law in Chriſt, and ſo to be no ſinner,*

ner, and therefore forgive thee all thy sin.] In our sence it is true and runs but thus [*I do repute Christ to have been perfectly just habitually and actually in the Person of a Mediator in the Nature of Man, and to have suffered as if he had been a sinner, in the Person of a Sponsor, by his own Consent, and that in the very place, and stead of sinners*; and by this to have satisfyed my Justice, and by both to have merited free *Justification* and *Life*, to be *given by the new Covenant to all Believers*: *And thou being a Believer, I do repute thee justified and adopted by this satisfactory and meritorious Righteousness of Christ, and by this free Covenant-Gift, as verily and surely as if thou hadst done it and suffered thy self.*

For my own part I find by experience, that almost all Christians that I talk with of it, have just this very notion of our Justification which I have expressed, till some particular Disputer by way of Controversie hath thrust the other notion into their mind. And for peace-sake I will say again, what I have elsewhere said, that I cannot think but that almost all Protestants agree in the substance of this point of Justification (though some having not Acuteness enough to form their *Notions* of it rightly, nor Humility enough to suspect their Understandings, wrangle about *Words*, supposing it to be about

bout the *Matter*) 4. Because I find that all are agreed, 1. That no Elect Person is Justified or Righteous by Imputation while he is an Infidel or Ungodly (except three or four that speak confusedly, and support the *Antinomians*) 2. That God doth not repute us to have done what Christ did in our *individual natural Persons Physically*: The Controversie is about a *Civil personating*. 3. That God judgeth not falsly. 4. That Christ was not our Delegate and Instrument sent by us to do this in our stead, as a man payeth his debt by a Servant whom he sendeth with the money. 5. That therefore Christs Righteousness is not Imputed to us, as if we had done it by him as our Instrument. 6. That all the fruits of Christs Merits and Satisfaction are not ours upon our first believing (much less before). But we receive them by degrees: we have new pardon daily of new sins: We bear castigatory punishments, even Death and Denials, or loss of the greater assistance of the Spirit: Our Grace is all imperfect, &c. 7. That we are under a Law (and not left ungoverned and lawless) and that Christ is our King and Judge: And this Law is the Law or Covenant of Grace, containing, besides the Precepts of perfect Obedience to the Law natural and superadded, a *Gift of Christ with Pardon and Life*;

but

but only on Condition that we thankfully and believingly *accept the Gift*; And threatning non-liberation, and a far forer punishment, to all that unbelievingly and unthankfully reject it. 8. That therefore this Testament or Covenant-Gift is God's Instrument, by which he giveth us our Right to Christ and Pardon and Life: And no man hath such Right but by this Testament-Gift. 9. That this, (called a Testament, *Covenant*, *Promise*, *and Law* in several respects) doth, besides the Conditions of our first Right, impose on us Continuance in the Faith, with sincere Holiness, as the necessary Condition of our continued Justification, and our actual Glorification. And that Heaven is the Reward of this keeping of the new Covenant, as to the *order of Gods Collation*, though as to the *value* of the Benefit, it is a *Free Gift*, purchased, merited and given by Christ. 10. That we shall all be judged by this Law of Christ. 11. That we shall all be judged according to our deeds; and those that have done good (not according to the Law of Innocency or Works, but according to the Law of Grace) shall go into everlasting life, and those that have done evil (not by meer sin as sin against the Law of Innocency) but by not keeping the Conditions

of

of the Law of Grace, ſhall go into everlaſting puniſhment. The ſober reading of theſe following texts may end all our Controverſie with men that dare not groſly make void the Word of God. *Rev.* 20. 12, 13. 22. 12. & 2. 23.) 12. That to be Juſtified at the day of Judgment, is, to be *adjudged to Life Eternal, and not condemned to Hell.* And therefore to be the cauſe or condition that we are *Judged to Glory*, and the Cauſe or Condition that we are *Juſtified* then, will be all one. 13. That to be *Judged* according to our deeds, is to be *Juſtified* or *Condemned* according to them. 14. That the great tryal of that day (as I have after ſaid) will not be, whether Chriſt hath done his part, but whether we have part in him, and ſo whether we have believed, and performed the Condition of that Covenant which giveth Chriſt and Life. 15. That the whole ſcope of Chriſt's Sermons, and all the Goſpel, calleth us from ſin, on the motive of avoiding Hell, (after we are reputed Righteous) and calleth us to Holineſs, Perſeverance and overcoming, on the motive of laying up a good Foundation, and having a Treaſure in Heaven, and getting the Crown of Righteouſneſs. 16. That the after-ſins of men imputed Righteous deſerve Hell, or at leaſt temporal puniſh-

puniſhments, and abatements of Grace and Glory. 17. That after ſuch ſins, eſpecially hainous, we muſt pray for Pardon, and repent that we may be pardoned, (and not ſay I fulfilled the Law in Chriſt as from my birth to my death, and therefore have no more need of Pardon.) 18. That he that ſaith he hath no ſin, deceiveth himſelf, and is a lyar. 19. That Magiſtrates muſt puniſh ſin as God's Officers; and Paſtors by Cenſure in Chriſts name; and Parents alſo in their Children. 20. That if Chriſts *Holineſs* and *perfect Obedience*, and Satisfaction and Merit, had bin *Ours* in *Right* and *Imputation*, as *ſimply* and *abſolutely* and *fully* as it was *his own*, we could have no *Guilt*, *no* need of *Pardon*, no ſuſpenſion or detention of the proper fruits of it, no puniſhment for ſin, (ſpecially not ſo great as the with-holding of degrees of Grace and Glory); And many of the conſequents aforeſaid could not have followed.

All this I think we are all agreed on; and none of it can with any face be denied by a Chriſtian. And if ſo; 1. Then whether Chriſts *perfect Holineſs* and *Obedience*, and *Sufferings*, *Merit* and *Satisfaction*, be all given us, and imputed unto us at our firſt believing as *Our own* in the very thing it ſelf, by a full and proper *Title* to the thing:

Or

Or only ſo *imputed to us*, as to be *judged a juſt cauſe of giving us all the effects in the degrees and time forementioned as God pleaſeth*, let all judge as evidence ſhall convince them. 2. And then, whether they do well that thruſt their deviſed ſence on the Churches as an Article of Faith, let the more impartial judge.

I conclude with this confeſſion to the Reader, that though the matter of theſe Papers hath been thought on theſe thirty years, yet the Script is *haſty*, and defective in order and fulneſs; I could not have leiſure ſo much as to affix in the margin all the texts which ſay what I aſſert: And ſeveral things, eſpecially the ſtate of the Caſe, are oft repeated. But that is, leſt once reading ſuffice not to make them obſerved and underſtood; which if many times will do, I have my end. If any ſay, that I ſhould take time to do things more accurately, I tell him that I know my ſtraights of time, and quantity of buſineſs better than he doth; and I will rather be defective in the mode of one work, than leave undone the ſubſtance of another as great.

July, 20. 1672. *Richard Baxter.*

The Contents.

CHap. 1. *The Hiſtory of the Controverſie. In the Apoſtles days: In the following Ages.* Auguſtine *and his followers Opinion. The Schoolmen.* Luther: Iſlebius: *The Lutherans*: Andr. Oſiander: *The latter German Divines who were againſt the Imputation of Chriſt's Active Righteouſneſs: Our Engliſh Divines:* Davenant's *ſenſe of Imputation.* Wotton. de Reconcil. Bradſhaw, Gataker, *Dr.* Criſp, Jo. Simpſon, Randal, Towne, *&c. And the Army-*Antinomians *checkt by the riſing of* Arminianiſm *there againſt it.* Jo. Goodwin, *Mr.* Walker, *and Mr.* Roborough; *Mr.* Ant. Burges; *My Own endeavours*; *Mr.* Cranden, *Mr.* Eyres, *&c. Mr.* Woodbridge, *Mr.* Tho. Warren, *Mr.* Hotchkis, *Mr.* Hopkins, *Mr.* Gibbon, *Mr.* Warton, *Mr.* Grailes, *Mr.* Jeſſop: *What I then aſſerted*: Corn. a Lapide, Vaſquez, Suarez, Grotius de Satisf. *Of the Savoy Declaration*; *Of the Faith of the Congregational-Divines: Their ſaying that Chriſt's Active and Paſſive Obedience is imputed for our ſole Righteouſneſs, confuted by Scripture.* Gataker, Uſher, *and* Vines *read and approved my Confeſſion of Faith.* Placeus *his Writings and trouble about the Imputation of* Adam's *Sin. Dr.* Gell, *Mr.* Thorndike, *&c. vehemently accuſing the doctrine of Imputed Righteouſneſs. The Conſent of all Chriſtians, eſpecially Proteſtants, about the ſenſe of Imputed Righteouſneſs.* 1. *The form of Baptiſm.* 2. *The Apoſtles Creed.* 3. *The* Nicene *and* Conſtantinopolitan *Creed.* 4. Athanaſius's *Creed.* 5. *The Fathers ſenſe:* Laurentius *his Collections:* Damaſus *his Creed.* 6. *The* Auguſtan

ſtan *Confeſſion.* 7. *The* Engliſh *Articles, Homilies and Confeſſion.* 8. *The* Saxon *Confeſſion.* 9. *The* Wittenberg *Confeſſion.* 10. *The* Bohemian *Confeſſion.* 11. *The* Palatinate *Confeſſion.* 12. *The* Polonian *Confeſſions.* 13. *The* Helvetian *Confeſſion.* 14. *The* Baſil *Confeſſion.* 15. *The* Argentine *Confeſſion of the four Cities.* 16. *The Synod of* Dort, *and the* Belgick *Confeſſion.* 17. *The* Scottiſh *Confeſſion.* 18. *The* French *Confeſſion. Whether Imputation of Paſſion and Satisfaction, or of meritorious Perfection go firſt: How Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is called the formal Cauſe, &c. That it is confeſſed that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed to us, as our ſin was to him.* Molinæus: Mareſius, Vaſſeur, Bellarmine *is conſtrained to agree with us. A recommendation of ſome brief, moſt clear, and ſufficient Treatiſes on this ſubject*; viz. 1. *Mr.* Bradſhaw; 2. *Mr.* Gibbon's *Sermon*; 3. *Mr.* Truman's *Great Propitiation.* 4. Placeus *his Diſput. in Theſ. Salmur.* 5. Le Blank's *Theſes: And thoſe that will read larger, Mr.* Watton, John Goodwin, *and Dr.* Stillingfleet.

Chap. 2. *The opening of the Caſe, by ſome Diſtinctions, and many Propoſitions:* Joh. Crocius *Conceſſions premiſed: Mr.* Lawſon's *Judgment.*

Chap. 3. *A further Explication of the Controverſie.*

Chap. 4. *My Reaſons againſt the denied ſenſe of Imputation and perſonating. The denied ſenſe repeated plainly. Forty three Reaſons briefly named.*

Chap. 5. *Some Objections anſwered.*

Chap. 6, 7, 8. *Replies to Dr.* Tully; *and a Defence of the Concord of* Proteſtants *againſt his Military Alarm, and falſe pretence of greater diſcord than there is.*

Of

Of the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs (Material or Formal) to Believers:

Whether we are Reputed perſonally to have ſuffered on the Croſs, and to have ſatisfied God's Juſtice for our own ſins, and to have been habitually perfectly Holy, and Actually perfectly Obedient, in Chriſt, or by Chriſt, and ſo to have merited our own Juſtification and Salvation. And whether Chriſt's Righteouſneſs Habitual Active and Paſſive, be ſtrictly made our own Righteouſneſs, in the very thing it ſelf ſimply Imputed to us, or only be made ours in the effects, and Righteouſneſs Imputed to us when we believe, becauſe Chriſt hath ſatisfied and fulfilled the Law, and thereby merited it for us. The laſt is affirmed, and the two firſt Queſtions denied.

I Have ſaid ſo much of this ſubject already in my Confeſſion, but eſpecially in my Diſputations of Juſtification, and in my Life of Faith that I thought not to have meddled with it any more; But ſome occaſions tell me that it is not yet needleſs, though thoſe that have moſt need will not read it. But while ſome of them hold, that nothing which they account a Truth about the *Form* and *Manner* of *Worſhip* is to be ſilenced for the Churches peace, they ſhould grant to me that *Real*

Truth ſo near the Foundation (in their own account) is not to be ſilenced when it *tendeth unto Peace.*

In opening my thoughts on this ſubject I ſhall reduce all to theſe Heads. 1. I ſhall give the brief *Hiſtory* of this Controverſie. 2. I ſhall open the true ſtate of it, and aſſert what is to be aſſerted, and deny what is to be denied. 3. I ſhall give you the Reaſons of my Denials. 4. I ſhall anſwer ſome Objections.

CHAP. I.

The Hiſtory of the Controverſie.

§ 1. IN the Goſpel it ſelf we have firſt *Chriſt's Doctrine delivered by his own mouth.* And in that there is ſo little ſaid of this Subject that I find few that will pretend thence to reſolve the Controverſie, for Imputation in the rigorous ſence. The ſame I ſay of the Acts of the Apoſtles, and all the reſt of the New Teſtament, except *Paul's* Epiſtles.

The Apoſtle *Paul*, having to do with the *Jews*, who could not digeſt the equalizing of the *Gentiles* with them, and ſpecially with the factious Jewiſh Chriſtians, who thought the *Gentiles* muſt become *Proſelytes* to *Moſes* as well as to Chriſt, if they would be Juſtified and Saved, at large confuteth this opinion, and freeth the Conſciences of the Gentile Chriſtians from the Impoſition of this yoke (as alſo did all the Apoſtles, *Act.* 15.) And in his arguing

guing, proveth that the Mosaical Law is so far from being necessary to the Justification of the *Gentiles*, that *Abraham* and the Godly *Jews* themselves were not Justified by it, but by *Faith*; And that by the *works of it* (and consequently not by the works of the Law or Covenant of Innocency, which no man ever kept) no man could ever be justified: And therefore that they were to look for Justification by Christ alone, and by Faith in him, or by meer Christianity; which the *Gentiles* might have as well as the *Jews*, the Partition-wall being taken down. This briefly is the true scope of *Paul* in these Controversies.

§ 2. But in *Paul's* own days, there were some things in his Epistles which the unlearned and unstable did wrest, as they did the other Scriptures, to their own destruction, as *Peter* tells us, 2 *Pet.* 2. And it seemeth by the Epistle of *James*, that this was part of it: For he is fain there earnestly to dispute against some, who thought that Faith without Christian works themselves, would justifie, and flatly affirmeth, that we are *Justified by Works, and not by Faith only*; that is, as it is a *Practical Faith*, in which is contained a *Consent* or *Covenant* to *obey*, which first putteth us into a justified state; so it is that *Practical Faith actually working by Love*, and the *actual performance* of our *Covenant*, which by *way* of *Condition* is *necessary* to our *Justification*, as *Continued* and as *Consummate by the Sentence of Judgment*. Against which sentence of *James* there is not a syllable to be found in *Paul*. But all the Scripture agreeth that *all men shall be Judged*, that is, *Justified* or *Condemned*, *according to their works*. But it is not this Controversie (between *Faith and*

Works) which I am now to ſpeak to, having done it enough heretofore.

§ 3. From the days of the Apoſtles till *Pelagius* and *Auguſtine*, this Controverſie was little meddled with: For the truth is, the Paſtors and Doctors took not Chriſtianity in thoſe days for a matter of Shcolaſtick ſubtilty, but of plain *Faith* and *Piety*. And contented themſelves to ſay that Chriſt dyed for our ſins, and that we are Juſtified by Faith; and that Chriſt was made unto us Righteouſneſs, as he was made to us Wiſdom, Sanctification and Redemption.

§ 4. But withal thoſe three firſt Ages were ſo intent upon Holineſs of Life, as that they addicted their Doctrine, their Zeal, and their conſtant endeavours to it: And particularly to great auſterities to their Bodies, in great Faſtings, and great contempt of the World, and exerciſes of Mortification, to kill their fleſhly Luſts, and deny their Wills, and Worldly Intereſts; to which end at laſt they got into Wilderneſſes, and Monaſteries, where, in Faſting and Prayer, and a ſingle life, they might live as it were out of the World, while they were in it; (Though indeed *perſecution* firſt drove them thither to ſave themſelves.) Into theſe Deſerts and Monaſteries thoſe went that had moſt Zeal, but not uſually moſt *Knowledg*: And they turned much of their Doctrine and diſcourſes about theſe Auſterities, and about the practices of a Godly Life, and about all the Miracles which were (ſome really) done, and (ſome feigned) by credulous ſoft people ſaid to be done among them. So that in all theſe ages moſt of their writings are taken up, 1. In defending Chriſtianity againſt the Heathens, which was the work

work of the Learned Doctors. 2. And in confuting ſwarms of Hereſies that ſprung up. 3. And in matters of Church-order, and Eccleſiaſtical and Monaſtical diſcipline. 4. And in the precepts of a Godly Life: But the point of Imputation was not only not meddled with diſtinctly, but almoſt all the Writers of thoſe times, ſeem to give very much to *Mans free-will*, and to *works of Holineſs*, and *ſufferings*, making too rare and obſcure mention of the diſtinct Intereſts of Chriſts Merits in our Juſtification, at leaſt, with any touch upon this Controverſie: Yet generally holding *Pardon*, and *Grace* and *Salvation* only by Chriſts Sacrifice and Merits; though they *ſpake* moſt of *Mans Holineſs*, when they called men to ſeek to make ſure of Salvation.

§ 5. And indeed at the day of Judgment, the Queſtion to be decided, will not be, Whether Chriſt dyed and did his part, but, Whether we believed and obeyed him and did our part: Not, Whether Chriſt performed his Covenant with the Father; but, Whether we performed our Covenant with him: For it is not Chriſt that is to be judged, *but we by Chriſt*.

§ 6. But *Pelagius* and *Auguſtine* diſputing about the Power of Nature and Freewill and the Grace of Chriſt, began to make it a matter of great Ingenuity (as *Eraſmus* ſpeaketh) to be a Chriſtian. *Pelagius* (a *Brittain*, of great wit, and continence, and a good and ſober life, as *Auſtin* ſaith, *Epiſt.* 120.) ſtifly defended the Power of Nature and Freewill, and made Grace to conſiſt only in the free Pardon of all ſin through Chriſt, and in the *Doctrine* and *Perſwaſions* only to a holy life for the time to come, with Gods common ordinary help. *Auguſtine* copiouſly

ouſly (and juſtly) defended God's ſpecial eternal Election of ſome, and his ſpecial Grace given them to make them repent and believe, and preſevere: (For though he maintained that ſome that were true Believers, Lovers of God, Juſtified and in a ſtate of Salvation, did fall away and periſh, yet he held that none of the *Elect* did fall *away and periſh*; And he maintained that even the Juſtified that fell away, had their Faith by a ſpecial Grace above nature.) *Vid. Auguſt. de bono Perſever. Cap.* 8, & 9. & *de Cor. & Grat. Cap.* 8, & 9. & *alibi paſſim.*

§ 7. In this their Controverſie, the point of Juſtification fell into frequent debate: But no Controverſie ever aroſe between them, *Whether Chriſt's perſonal Righteouſneſs conſidered Materially or Formally*, was by Imputation made ours as Proprietors of the thing it ſelf, diſtinct from its effects; or, Whether God reputed us to have ſatisfied and alſo perfectly obeyed in Chriſt. For *Auguſtine* himſelf, while he vehemently defendeth free Grace, ſpeaketh too little even of the Pardon of ſin: And though he ſay, that *Free Pardon* of ſins is part of Grace, yet he maketh *Juſtification* to be that which we call Sanctification, that makes us inherently Righteous or new-Creatures, by the operation of the Holy Ghoſt: And he thinketh that this is the Juſtification which *Paul* pleadeth to be of Grace and not of works; yet including *Pardon of ſin*, and confeſſing that *ſometimes* to Juſtifie, ſignifieth in Scripture, not to make juſt, but to *judg juſt*. And though in it ſelf this be but *de nomine*, and not *de re*; yet, 1. no doubt but as to many texts of Scripture *Auſtin* was miſtaken, though ſome few texts *Bezæ* and others confeſs to be taken in his ſence: 2. And the expoſition of many

many texts lieth upon it. But he that took Juſtification to be by the operation of the Holy Ghoſt giving us Love to God, could not take it to be by Imputation in the rigorous ſence no queſtion; nor doth *de re*.

§ 8. But becauſe, as ſome that, it ſeems, never read *Auguſtine*, or underſtood not plain words, have nevertheleſs ventured confidently to deny what I have ſaid of his Judgment in the points of Perſeverance (in my Tract of Perſeverance) ſo, it's like ſuch men will have no more warineſs what they ſay in the point of Juſtification; I will cite a few of *Auguſtin's* words among many, to ſhow what he took Juſtification to be, though I differ from him *de nomine*.

Nec quia recti ſunt corde, ſed etiam ut recti fiat corde, pretendit Juſtitiam ſuam, quâ juſtificat impium —— *Quo motu receditur ab illo fonte vitæ, cujus ſolius hauſtu juſtitia bibitur, bona ſcil. vita.* Aug. *de* Spir. *&* Lit. Cap. 7.

Deus eſt enim qui operatur in eis & velle & operari, pro bona voluntate. Hæc eſt Juſtitia Dei, hoc eſt, quam Deus donat homini quum juſtificat impium. Hanc Dei juſtitiam ignorantes ſuperbi Judæi, & ſuam volentes conſtituere, juſtitiæ Dei non ſunt ſubjecti. —— *Dei quippe dixit Juſtitiam, quæ homini ex Deo eſt, ſuam vero, quam putant ſibi ſufficere ad facienda mandata ſine adjutorio & dono ejus qui legem dedit. His autem ſimiles ſunt qui cum profiteantur ſe eſſe Chriſtianos, ipſi gratiæ Chriſti ſic adverſantur ut ſe humanis viribus divina exiſtiment implere mandata.* Epiſt. 120. cap. 21. *&* 22. *&* Epiſt. 200.

Et de Spir. *&* lit. c. 26. *Factores juſtificabuntur:* —— *Non tanquam per opera, nam per Gratiam juſtificentur:*

ficentur : Cum dicat Gratis juſtificari hominem per fidem ſine operibus legis, nihilque aliud velit intelligi in eo quod dicit Gratis, niſi quia juſtificationem opera non precedunt : Aperte quippe alibi dicit, ſi gratiâ, jam non ex operibus : alioquin gratia non eſt gratia. Sed ſic intelligendum eſt, factores Legis juſtificabuntur, ut ſciamus eos non eſſe factores legis niſi juſtificentur ; ut non juſtificatio factoribus accedat, ſed factores legis juſtificatio precedat : Quid eſt enim aliud Juſtificati, quam Juſti facti, ab illo ſcilicet qui juſtificat Impium, ut ex impio fiat juſtus ? —— Aut certe ita dictum eſt, Juſtificabuntur, ac ſi diceretur Juſti habebuntur, juſti deputabuntur.

Et ibid. cap. 29. *Gentes quæ non ſectabantur juſtitiam apprehenderunt juſtitiam, Juſtitiam autem quæ ex fide eſt, impetrando eam ex Deo, non ex ſeipſis preſumendo ; Iſrael vero perſequens legem juſtitiæ, in legem juſtitiæ, non pervenit : Quare ? Quia non ex fide, ſed tanquam ex operibus : id eſt tanquam eam per ſeipſos operantes ; non in ſe credentes operari Deum. Deus eſt enim qui operatur in nobis —— Finis enim legis Chriſtus eſt omni credenti. Et adhuc dubitamus quæ ſint opera legis, quibus homo non juſtificatur ; ſi ea tanquam ſua crediderit ſine adjutorio & dono Dei, quod eſt ex fide Jeſu Chriſti —— Ut poſſit homo facere bona & Sancta, Deus operatur in homine per fidem Jeſu Chriſti, qui finis ad Juſtitiam omni credenti : id eſt, per Spiritum incorporatus factuſque membrum ejus, poteſt quiſque illo incrementum intrinſecus dante, operari juſtitiam. —— Juſtificatio autem ex fide impetratur —— In tantum juſtus, in quantum ſalvus. Per hanc enim fidem credemus, quod etiam nos Deus a mortuis excitet interim Spiritu, ut in novitate ejus gratiæ temperanter & juſte & pie viva-*

vivamus in hoc ſeculo — qui in Reſurrectione ſibi congrua, hoc eſt, in Juſtificatione precedit: —— c. 30. *Fides impetrat gratiam qua Lex impleatur.* ——

Cap. 28. pag. 315. *Ibi Lex Dei, non ex omni parte delata per injuſtitiam, profecto ſcribitur, renovata, per gratiam: Nec iſtam inſcriptionem, quæ Juſtificatio eſt, poterat efficere in Judæis Lex in tabulis ſcripta.*

Ibid. Cap. 9. pag. 307, 308. *Juſtitia Dei manifeſtata eſt: non dixit, Juſtitia hominis vel juſtitia propriæ voluntatis, ſed juſtitia Dei; Non qua Deus juſtus eſt; ſed qua induit, hominem cum juſtificat impium. Hæc teſtificatur per Legem & Prophetas. Huic quippe teſtimonium perhibent Lex & Prophetæ. Lex quidem hoc ipſo, quod jubendo, & minando, & neminem juſtificando, ſatis indicat dono Dei juſtificari hominem per* Adjutorium Spiritus —— *Juſtitia autem Dei per fidem Jeſu Chriſti, hoc eſt, per fidem qua Creditur in Chriſtum: ſicut autem iſta fides Chriſti dicta non eſt, qua Credit Chriſtus, ſic & illa Juſtitia Dei non qua Juſtus eſt Deus. Utrumque enim Noſtrum eſt ſed ideo Dei & Chriſti dicitur quod ejus nobis largitate donatur.* —— *Juſtitia Dei ſine lege eſt, quam Deus per* Spiritum Gratiæ *Credenti confert ſine adjutorio legis.* —— *Juſtificati gratis per gratiam ipſius: non quod fine voluntate noſtra fiat, ſed voluntas noſtra offenditur infirma per legem, ut ſanet Gratia Voluntatem, & ſanata voluntas impleat Legem.* —— *Et* cap. 10. *Confugiant per fidem ad Juſtificantem Gratiam, & per donum Spiritus ſuavitate juſtitiæ delectati, pœnam literæ minantis evadant.* Vid. Ep. 89. q. 2. *Et* lib. 3. *ad* Bonifac. c. 7.

Et Tract. 3. in Joan. when he ſaith that, *Omnes qui per Chriſtum Juſtificati juſti, non in ſe, ſed in illo*; he expoundeth it of Regeneration by Chriſt.

Et

Et Serm. 15. de verb. Apoſt. *Sine voluntate tua non erit in te Juſtitia Dei. Voluntas non eſt niſi tua; Juſtitia non eſt niſi Dei:* he expounds it of Holineſs. —— *Traditus eſt propter delicta noſtra, & reſurrexit, propter juſtificationem noſtram. Quid eſt, Propter Juſtificationem noſtram? Ut juſtificet nos, & juſtos faciat nos. Eris opus Dei non ſolum quia homo es ſed quia Juſtus es: Qui fecit te ſine te, non te juſtificat ſine te: Tamen ipſe juſtificat, ne ſit juſtitia tua.* —— *Dei juſtitiam dat non litera occidens, ſed* vivificans Spiritus. —— Vid. *de* Grat. Chriſti Cap. 13, 14.

Abundance ſuch paſſages in *Auguſtine* fully ſhew that he took Juſtification to ſignifie Sanctification, or the Spirits renovation of us; and thinks it is called the Righteouſneſs of God and Chriſt, and not ours, becauſe by the Spirit he worketh it in us. And when he ſaith that *bona opera ſequuntur Juſtificatum, non precedunt Juſtificandum* (as in ſence he often doth) he meaneth that we are *freely ſanctified*, before we do good. I would cite abundance, but for ſwelling the writing, and tiring the Reader. And his followers *Proſper*, and *Fulgentius* go the ſame way, as you may eaſily find in their writings.

Johan. Crocius in his copious Treatiſe of Juſtification, *Diſp. 9. p.* 442. ſaith, *Auguſtinum Juſtificationis nomine utramque partem complecti, id eſt, tum Remiſſionem peccatorum quæ proprie Juſtificatio dicitur, tum Sanctificationem —— Cum quo nos ſentimus quoad rem ipſam, tantum diſſidemus in loquendi formâ.*

§ 9. The Schoolmen being led by the Scholaſtick wit of *Auguſtine*, fell into the ſame phraſe of ſpeech and opinions, *Lombard* making *Auguſtine* his

his Maſter, and the reſt making him theirs, till ſome began to look more towards the Semipelagian way.

§ 10. And when Church-Tyranny and Ignorance, had obſcured the Chriſtian Light, the true ſence of Juſtification by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, was much obſcured with the reſt, and a world of humane inventions under the name of Good works, were brought in to take up the peoples minds; And the merits of man, and of the Virgin *Mary*, ſounded louder than the merits of Chriſt, in too many places: And the people that were ignorant of the true Juſtification, were filled with the noiſe of Pardons, Indulgences, Satisfactions, Penances, Pilgrimages, and ſuch like.

§ 11. *Luther* finding the Church in this dangerous and woful ſtate, where he lived, did labour to reduce mens minds and truſt, from humane ſopperies and merits, and indulgences, to Chriſt, and to help them to the Knowledg of true Righteouſneſs: But according to his temper in the heat of his Spirit, he ſometimes let fall ſome words which ſeemed plainly to make Chriſts own perſonal Righteouſneſs in it ſelf to be every Believers own by Imputation, and our ſins to be verily Chriſts own ſins in themſelves by Imputation: Though by many other words he ſheweth that he meant only, that our ſins were Chriſts in *the effects* and not in themſelves, and Chriſts perſonal Righteouſneſs ours in the effects and not in it ſelf.

§ 12. But his Book on the *Galatians*, and ſome other words, gave occaſion to the errours of ſome then called *Antinomians*, and afterward *Libertines* (when ſome additions were made to their errours.) Of theſe *Iſlebius Agricola* was the chief: Whom *Luther*

Luther confuted and reduced, better expounding his own words: But *Islebius* ere long turned back to the Contrary extreme of Popery, and with *Sidonius* and *Julius Pflug*, (three Popish Bishops made for that purpose) promoted the Emperours *Interim* to the persecution of the Protestants.

§ 13. The Protestant Reformers themselves spake variously of this subject. Most of them rightly asserted that Christ's Righteousness was ours by the way of Meriting our Righteousness, which was therefore said to be Imputed to us. Some of them follow'd *Luthers* first words, and said that Christs sufferings and all his personal Righteousness was Imputed to us, so as to be ours in it self, and when judged as if we had personally done what he did, and were righteous with the same Righteousness that he was.

§ 14. *Ambsdorfius*, *Gallus*, and some other hot *Lutherans* were so jealous of the *name* of works, that they maintained that good works were not necessary to Salvation. (Yea as to Salvation some called them hurtful:) And *Georgius Major* a Learned sober Divine was numbered by them among the *Hereticks*, for maintaining that Good works were necessary to Salvation; as you may see in the perverse writings of *Chlusseburgius* and many others.

§ 15. *Andreas Osiander* (otherwise a Learned Protestant) took up the opinion, that we are Justified by the very essential Righteousness of God himself. But he had few followers.

§ 16. The Papists fastening upon those Divines who held Imputation of Christs personal Righteousness in it self in the rigid sence, did hereupon greatly insult against the Protestants, as if it had been

been their common doctrine, and it greatly ſtopt the Reformation: For many ſeeing that ſome made that a Fundamental in our difference, and *articulus ſtantis & cadentis Eccleſiæ*, and ſeeing how eaſily it was diſproved, how fully it was againſt the Doctrine of all the ancient Church, and what intolerable Conſequences followed, did judge by that of the reſt of our Doctrine, and were ſettledly hardened againſt all.

§ 17. The Learned Divines of *Germany* perceiving this, fell to a freſh review of the Controverſie, and after a while abundance of very Learned Godly Doctors fell to diſtinguiſh between the Active and Paſſive Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; and not accurately diſtinguiſhing of Imputation, becauſe they perceived that Chriſt ſuffered in our ſtead, in a fuller ſenſe than he could be ſaid to be *Holy* in our ſtead, or fulfil the Law in our ſtead. Hereupon they principally managed the Controverſie, as about the ſort of Righteouſneſs Imputed to us: And a great number of the moſt Learned famous Godly Divines of the Reformed Churches, maintained that Chriſt's Paſſive Righteouſneſs was Imputed to us, even his whole Humiliation or Suffering, by which the pardon of all ſins of Commiſſion and Omiſſion was procured for us; but that his *Active Righteouſneſs* was not Imputed to us, though it profited us; but was *Juſtitia Perſonæ* to make Chriſt a fit Sacrifice for our ſins, having none of his own, but the Suffering was his *Juſtitia Meriti*. His Obedience they ſaid was performed *noſtro bono, non noſtro loco*, for our good but not in our ſtead; but his *Sufferings*, both *noſtro bono & loco*; both *for our good* and in *our ſtead*: but neither of them ſo ſtrictly *in noſtrâ Perſonâ* in our Perſon, as if we did it by and in Chriſt. The Writers that de-

ſended this were *Cargius*, and that holy man *Olevian* and *Urſine*, and *Pareus*, and *Scultetus*, and *Piſcator*, *Alſtedius*, *Wendeline*, Beckman, and many more. He that will ſee the ſum of their arguings may read it in *Wendeline's Theolog. lib.* 1. *cap.* 25. and in *Pareus* his *Miſcellanies* after *Urſine's Corpus Theolog.* After them *Camero* with his Learned followers took it up in France. *Leg. Cameron. p.* 364. 390. *Theſ. Sal. vol.* 1. *Placei Diſp. de Juſt.* § 29. *& Part.* 2 *de Satisf.* § 42. So that at that time (as *Pareus* tells you) there were four opinions: ſome thought Chriſt's Paſſive Righteouſneſs only was Imputed to us; ſome alſo his *Active* inſtead of our Actual Obedience; ſome alſo his *Habitual* inſtead of our Habitual perfection; And ſome thought alſo his Divine Righteouſneſs was Imputed to us, becauſe of our Union with Chriſt, God and Man. (Imputed I ſay; for I now ſpeak not of *Oſiander's* opinion of Inheſion.) And *Lubbertus* wrote a Conciliatory Tractate favouring thoſe that were for the Paſſive part. And *Forbes* hath written for the Paſſive only imputed. *Molinæus* caſteth away the diſtinction, *Theſ. Sedan. v.* 1. *p.* 625. § 18.

§ 18. In England moſt Divines uſed the phraſe, that we were Juſtified by the forgiveneſs of ſin and the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, and being accepted as Righteous unto life thereon: But the ſenſe of Imputation few pretended accurately to diſcuſs. *Davenant* who dealt moſt elaborately in it, and maintaineth Imputation ſtiffly, in terms; yet when he telleth you what Proteſtants mean by it, ſaith, that [*Poſſunt nobis imputari, non ſolum noſtræ paſſiones, actiones, qualitates, ſed etiam extrinſeca quædam, quæ nec a nobis fluunt, nec in nobis hæ-*

rent

rent: De facto autem Imputantur, quando illorum intuitus & reſpectus valent nobis ad aliquem effectum, æque ac ſi a nobis aut in nobis eſſent. (Note, that he ſaith, but *ad aliquem effectum, non ad omnem.*) And he inſtanceth in one that is a *ſlothful fellow himſelf, but is advanced to the Kings Favour and Nobility for ſome great Service done by his Progenitors to the Common-wealth.* And in *one that deſerving death is pardoned through the Intereſſion of a friend, or upon ſome ſuffering in his ſtead which the King impoſeth on his Friend.* This is the Imputation which *Davenant* and other ſuch Proteſtants plead for; which I think is not to be denied. Were it not for lengthening the diſcourſe and wearying the Reader, I would cite many other of our greateſt Divines, who plead for the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, that *Davenant* here expoundeth himſelf.

But ſome leſs judicious grating upon a harſh and unſound ſence, Mr. *Anthony Wotton* a very Learned and Godly Divine of *London*, wrote a *Latine* Treatiſe *de Reconciliatione*, one of the Learnedſt that hath ever been written of that ſubject, in which he laboureth to diſprove the rigid Imputation of Chriſts Holineſs and Obedience to man; and ſheweth that he is Righteous to whom all ſin of Omiſſion and Commiſſion is forgiven; and confuteth theſe three Aſſertions. 1. That *A Sinner is Reputed to have fulfilled the Law in and by Chriſt.* 2. *And being reputed to have fulfilled the Law, is taken for formally juſt as a fulfiller of it.* 3. *And being formally juſt as a fullfiller of the Law, Life eternal is due to him by that Covenant*, that ſaith, *do this and live.* Vid. Part. 2. li. 1. Cap. 11. pag. 152. *Cum ſequentibus.* Thus and much further *Mr. Wotton* went to

the very quick of the Controverſie, and irrefragably overthrew the rigid Imputation.

But Mr. *William Bradſhaw*, a Learned Godly Nonconformiſt, being grieved at the differences about the Active and Paſſive Righteouſneſs, and thinking that Mr. *Wotton* denied all Imputation of the Active Righteouſneſs (which he did not, but owneth it to be Imputed as a meritorious Cauſe:) Part. 2. li. 1. Cap. 13. pag. 165. *Ne illud quidem negaverim, imputari nobis illius juſtitiam & obedientiam, ut ad noſtrum fructum redundet: Id unum non concedo, Legem nos in Chriſto & per Chriſtum ſervâſſe, ut propter eam a nobis præſtitam vita æterna ex fœdere, Hoc fac et vives, debeatur.* Mr. *Bradſhaw* I ſay attempted a Conciliatory middle way, which indeed is the ſame in the main with Mr. *Wotton's*: He honoureth the Learned Godly perſons on each ſide, but maintaineth that the Active and Paſſive Righteouſneſs are both Imputed, but not in the rigid ſence of Imputation denying both theſe Propoſitions. 1. *That Chriſt by the Merits of his Paſſive Obedience only, hath freed us from the guilt of all ſin, both Actual and Original, of Omiſſion and Commiſſion.* 2. *That in the Imputation of Chriſts Obedience both Active and Paſſive, God doth ſo behold and conſider a ſinner in Chriſt, as if the ſinner himſelf had done and ſuffered thoſe very particulars which Chriſt did and ſuffered for him.* And he wrote a ſmall book with great accurateneſs in *Engliſh* firſt, and *Latin* after, opening the nature of Juſtification, which hath been deſervedly applauded ever ſince. His boſom-Friend Mr. *Tho. Gataker*, (a man of rare Learning and Humility) next ſet in to defend Mr. *Bradſhaw's* way, and wrote in *Latin* Animadverſions on *Lucius* (who oppoſed *Piſcator*,

Piſcator, and erred on one ſide for rigid Imputation) and on *Piſcator* who on the other ſide was for Juſtification by the Paſſive Righteouſneſs only; and other things he wrote with great Learning and Judgment in that cauſe.

About that time the Doctrine of perſonal Imputation in the rigid ſence began to be fully improved in *England*, by the Sect of the *Antinomians* (trulyer called *Libertines*) of whom Dr. *Criſpe* was the moſt eminent Ring-leader, whoſe books took wonderfully with ignorant Profeſſors under the pretence of extolling Chriſt and free-Grace. After him roſe Mr. *Randal*, and Mr. *John Simpſon*, and then Mr. *Town*, and at laſt in the Armies of the Parliament, *Saltmarſh*, and ſo many more, as that it ſeemed to be likely to have carried moſt of the Profeſſors in the Army, and abundance in the City and Country that way: But that ſuddenly (one Novelty being ſet up againſt another) the opinions called *Arminianiſm* roſe up againſt it, and gave it a check and carryed many in the Army and City the clean contrary way: And theſe two Parties divided a great part of the raw injudicious ſort of the profeſſors between them, which uſually are the greateſt part: but eſpecially in the Army which was like to become a Law and example to others.

Before this *John Goodwin* (not yet turned *Arminian*) preached and wrote with great diligence about Juſtification againſt the rigid ſence of Imputation, who being anſwered by Mr. *Walker*, and Mr. *Robourough*, with far inferiour ſtrength, his book had the greater ſucceſs for ſuch anſwerers.

The *Antinomians* then ſwarming in *London*, Mr. *Anthony Burges*, a very worthy Divine was em-

ployed to Preach and Print againſt them; which he did in ſeveral books: but had he been acquainted with the men as I was, he would have found more need to have vindicated the Goſpel againſt them than the Law.

Being daily converſant my ſelf with the *Antinomian* and *Arminian* Souldiers, and hearing their daily conteſts, I thought it pitty that nothing but one extreme ſhould be uſed to beat down that other, and I found the *Antinomian* party far the ſtronger, higher, and more fierce, and working towards greater changes and ſubverſions; And I found that they were juſt falling in with *Saltmarſh*, that *Chriſt hath repented and believed for us, and that we muſt no more queſtion our Faith and Repentance, than Chriſt.* This awakened me better to ſtudy theſe points; And being young, and not furniſhed with ſufficient reading of the Controverſie, and alſo being where were no libraries, I was put to ſtudy only the *naked matter in it ſelf.* Whereupon I ſhortly wrote a ſmall book called *Aphoriſms* of Juſtification, &c. Which contained that Doctrine in ſubſtance which I judg ſound; but being the firſt that I wrote, it had ſeveral expreſſions in it which needed correction; which made me ſuſpend or retract it till I had time to reform them. Mens judgments of it were various, ſome for it and ſome againſt it: I had before been a great eſteemer of two books of one name, *Vindiciæ Gratiæ*, Mr. *Pembles* and Dr. *Twiſſes*, above moſt other books. And from them I had taken in the opinion of a double Juſtification, one *in foro Dei* as an Immanent eternal Act of God, and another *in foro Conſcientiæ*, the Knowledg of that; and I knew no other: But now I ſaw, that neither of

thoſe

thoſe was the Juſtification which the Scripture ſpake of. But ſome half-*Antinomians* which were for the Juſtification before Faith, which I wrote againſt, were moſt angry with my book. And Mr. *Crandon* wrote againſt it, which I anſwered in an *Apologie*, and fullyer wrote my judgment in my *Confeſſion*; and yet more fully in ſome Diſputations of Juſtification againſt Mr. *Burges*, who had in a book of Juſtification made ſome exceptions; and pag. 346. had defended that [*As in Chriſt's ſuffering we were looked upon by God as ſuffering in him; ſo by Chriſts obeying of the Law, we were beheld as fulfilling the Law in him.*] To thoſe Diſputations I never had any anſwer. And ſince then in my *Life of Faith*, I have opened the *Libertine* errours about Juſtification, and ſtated the ſence of Imputation.

Divers writers were then employed on theſe ſubjects: Mr. *Eyers* for Juſtification before Faith (that is, of elect Infidels) and Mr. *Benjamin Woodbridg*, Mr. *Tho. Warren* againſt it. Mr. *Hotchkis* wrote a conſiderable Book of Forgiveneſs of ſin, defending the ſounder way: Mr. *George Hopkins*, wrote to prove that Juſtification and Sanctification are equally carryed on together: Mr. *Warton*, Mr. *Gnaile*, Mr. *Jeſſop*, (clearing the ſence of Dr. *Twiſſe*,) and many others wrote againſt *Antinomianiſm*. But no man more clearly opened the whole doctrine of Juſtification, than Learned and Pious Mr. *Gibbons* Miniſter at *Black-Fryers*, in a Sermon Printed in the *Lectures* at *St. Giles* in the *Fields*. By ſuch endeavours the before-prevailing *Antinomianiſm* was ſuddenly and ſomewhat marvelouſly ſuppreſſed, ſo that there was no great noiſe made by it.

About Imputation that which I aſſerted was a-

gainſt the two fore-deſcribed extremes; in ſhort, " That *we are Juſtified by Chriſt's whole Righteouſ-* " *neſs, Paſſive, Active,* and *Habitual,* yea the *Di-* " *vine* ſo far included as by *Union* advancing the reſt " to a valuable ſufficiency: That the Paſſive, that is, " Chriſt's whole Humiliation is *ſatisfactory* firſt, and " ſo meritorious, and the Active and Habitual meri- " torious primarily. That as God the Father did " appoint to Chriſt as Mediator his Duty for our " Redemption by a Law or Covenant, ſo Chriſt's " whole fulfilling that Law, or performance of his " Covenant-Conditions as ſuch (by Habitual and " Actual perfection, and by Suffering) made up " one Meritorious Cauſe of our Juſtification, not " diſtinguiſhing with Mr. *Gataker* of the pure mo- " ral, and the ſervile part of Chriſt's Obedience, ſave " only as one is more a part of Humiliation than the " other, but in point of Merit taking in all: That " as Chriſt ſuffered in our ſtead that we might not " ſuffer, and obeyed in our nature, that perfection " of Obedience might not be neceſſary to our *Ju-* " *ſtification*, and this in the perſon of a Mediator " and Sponſor for us ſinners, but not ſo in our *Per-* " *ſons*, as that we truely in a moral or civil ſence, " did all this in and by him; Even ſo God repu- " teth the thing to be as it is, and ſo far Imputeth " Chriſt's Righteouſneſs and Merits and Satisfaction " to us, as that it is Reputed by him the true Me- " ritorious Cauſe of our Juſtification; and that for " it God maketh a Covenant of Grace, in which he " freely giveth Chriſt, Pardon and Life to all that " accept the Gift as it is; ſo that the Accepters " are by this Covenant or Gift as ſurely juſtified " and ſaved by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs as if they had

" Obeyed

" Obeyed and Satisfied themſelves. Not that Chriſt " meriteth that we ſhall have Grace to fulfil the " Law our ſelves and ſtand before God in a Righ- " teouſneſs of our own, which will anſwer the Law " of works and juſtifie us: But that the Conditi- " ons of the Gift in the Covenant of Grace being " performed by every penitent Believer, that *Cove-* " *nant* doth *pardon* all *their ſins* (as Gods Inſtru- " ment) and giveth them a *Right* to *Life eternal*, " *for Chriſts Merits.*

This is the ſence of Imputation which I and others aſſerted as the true healing middle way. And as bad as they are, among the moſt Learned Papiſts, *Cornelius* a *Lapide* is cited by Mr. *Wotton*, *Vaſquez* by *Davenant*, *Suarez* by Mr. *Burges*, as ſpeaking for ſome ſuch Imputation, and Merit: *Grotius de Satisf.* is clear for it.

But the Brethren called Congregational or Independant in their Meeting at the *Savoy*, *Oct.* 12. 1658. publiſhing a Declaration of their Faith, *Cap.* 11. have theſe words [*Thoſe whom God effectually calleth, he alſo freely juſtifieth; not by infuſing Righteouſneſs into them, but by pardoning their Sins, and by accounting and accepting their perſons as Righteous, not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Chriſts ſake alone: not by imputing Faith it ſelf, the act of believing, or any other evangelical Obedience to them, as their Righteouſneſs; but by Imputing Chriſts Active Obedience to the whole Law, and Paſſive Obedience in his death, for their whole and ſole Righteouſneſs, they receiving and reſting on him and his Righteouſneſs by Faith.*]

Upon the publication of this it was variouſly ſpoken of: ſome thought that it gave the *Papiſts*

ſo

ſo great a ſcandal, and advantage to reproach the *Proteſtants* as denying all inherent Righteouſneſs, that it was neceſſary that we ſhould diſclaim it: Others ſaid that it was not their meaning to deny Inherent Righteouſneſs, though their words ſo ſpake, but only that we are not juſtified by it: Many ſaid that it was not the work of all of that party, but of ſome few that had an inclination to ſome of the *Antinomian* principles, out of a miſtaken zeal of free Grace; and that it is well known that they differ from us, and therefore it cannot be imputed to us, and that it is beſt make no ſtir about it, leſt it irritate them to make the matter worſe by a Defence, & give the Papiſts too ſoon notice of it. And I ſpake with one Godly Miniſter that was of their Aſſembly, who told me, that they did not ſubſcribe it, and that they meant but to deny Juſtification by inherent Righteouſneſs. And though ſuch men in the Articles of their declared Faith, no doubt can ſpeak intelligibly and aptly, and are to be underſtood as they ſpeak according to the common uſe of the words; yet even able-men ſometimes may be in this excepted, when eager engagement in an opinion and parties, carryeth them too precipitantly, and maketh them forget ſomething, that ſhould be remembred. The Sentences here which we excepted againſt are theſe two. But the firſt was not much offenſive becauſe their meaning was right; *And the ſame words are in the Aſſemblies Confeſſion, though they might better have been left out.*

Scrip-

Scriptures.	*Declaration.*
Rom. 4. 3. What ſaith the Scripture? *Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for Righteouſneſs.*	[1 Not by imputing Faith it ſelf, part of Believing, or any other Evangelical Obedience to them as their Righteouſneſs]

Ver. 5. *To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that Juſtifyeth the Ungodly, his* Faith *is counted for Righteouſneſs.*

Ver. 9. *For we ſay that* Faith *was reckoned to Abraham for Righteouſneſs: How was it then reckoned?*

Ver. 11. *And he received the ſign of Circumciſion, a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of the Faith, which he had yet being uncircumciſed, that he might be the Father of all them that believe,——that Righteouſneſs might be imputed to them alſo.*—— Ver 13. *Through the Righteouſneſs of Faith.*—— Ver. 16. *Therefore it is of Faith that it might be by Grace.*—— vid. Ver. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. *He was ſtrong in Faith, fully perſwaded that what he had promiſed, he was able alſo to perform; and therefore it was Imputed to him for Righteouſneſs. Now it was not written for his ſake alone that it was imputed to him, but for us alſo, to whom it ſhall be imputed, if we* (or, who) believe on him that raiſed up Jeſus our Lord from the dead.

Gen. 15. 5, 6. *Tell the Stars——ſo ſhall thy ſeed be: And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for Righteouſneſs,* Jam. 2. 21, 22, 23, 24. Was not *Abraham* our Father juſtified, by Works?—— And the Scripture was fulfilled which ſaith, *Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs.*

Luk.

Luk. 19. 17. *Well done thou good Servant, Becauſe thou haſt been Faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten Cities.*

Mat. 25. 34, 35, 40, *Come ye bleſſed.* —— *For I was hungry and ye gave me Meat.*

Gen. 22. 16, 17, *By my ſelf I have ſworn.* —— *Becauſe thou haſt done this thing.* ——

Joh. 16. 27. *For the Father himſelf loveth you, becauſe you have loved me and have believed that I came out from God.* Many ſuch paſſages are in Scripture.

Our opinion is, 1. That it is better to juſtifie and expound the Scripture, than flatly to deny it: If Scripture ſo oft ſay, that *Faith* is *reckoned* or *Imputed* for *Righteouſneſs*, it becometh not Chriſtians, to ſay, *It is not*: But to ſhew in what ſence it is, and in what it is not. For if it be ſo Imputed in *no ſence*, the Scripture is made falſe: If in any ſence it ſhould not be univerſally denied but with diſtinction.

2. We hold, that in Juſtification there is conſiderable, 1. The Purchaſing and Meritorious Cauſe of Juſtification freely given in the new Covenant. This is only Chriſt's Sufferings and Righteouſneſs, and ſo it is Reputed of God, and Imputed to us. 2. The *Order of Donation*, which is, On *Condition of Acceptance*; And ſo 3. The Condition of our *Title* to the free Gift by this Covenant; And that is, Our Faith, or Acceptance of the Gift according to its nature and uſe. And thus God Reputeth Faith, and Imputeth it to us, requiring but this *Condition of us* (which alſo he worketh in us) by the Covenant of Grace; whereas perfect Obedience

dience *was required of us*, by the Law of Innocency. If we err in this explication, it had been better to confute us than deny God's Word.

Scriptures beſides the former. *Declaration.*

1 Joh. 2. 29. *Every one which doth Righteouſneſs is born of God.* —— & 3. 7, 10. *He that doth Righteouſneſs is Righteous, even as he is Righteous.* —— *Whoſoever doth not righteouſneſs is not of God.* [2 For their ſole Righteouſneſs.]

2 Tim. 4. 8. *He hath laid up for us a Crown of Righteouſneſs.*

Heb. 11. 23. *Through Faith they wrought Righteouſneſs.* —— Heb. 12. *The peaceable fruit of Righteouſneſs.* —— Jam. 3. 18. *The fruit of Righteouſneſs is ſown in Peace.* —— 1 Pet. 2. 24. *That we being dead to ſin, ſhould live unto righteouſneſs,* Mat 5. 20. *Except your Righteouſneſs exceed the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, &c.* —— Luk. 1. 71. *In Holineſs and Righteouſneſs before him all the days of our Life.* —— Act. 10. 35. *He that feareth God, and worketh Righteouſneſs is accepted of him,* —— Rom. 6. 13, 16, 18, 19, 20. *Whether of ſin unto death, or of Obedience unto Righteouſneſs.* —— 1 Cor. 15. 34. *Awake to Righteouſneſs and ſin not.* —— Eph. 5. 9. *The fruit of the Spirit is in all Goodneſs, and Righteouſneſs.* —— Dan. 12. 3. *They ſhall turn many to Righteouſneſs.* —— Dan. 4. 27. *Break off thy ſins by Righteouſneſs.* —— Eph. 4. 24. *The new-man which after God is created in Righteouſneſs.* —— Gen. 7. 1. *Thee have I ſeen Righteous before me.* —— Gen. 18. 23, 24, 25, 26. *Far be it from thee, to deſtroy the Righteous with the Wicked.* —— Prov. 24. 24. *He*

that

that ſaith to the Wicked thou art Righteous, him ſhall the people Curſe, Nations ſhall abhor him. —— Iſa. 3. 10. *Say to the Righteous, it ſhall be well with him,* Iſa. 5. 23. *That take away the Righteouſneſs from the Righteous.* —— Mat. 25. 37, 46. *Then ſhall the Righteous anſwer.* —— *The Righteous into life eternal.* —— Luk. 1. 6. *They were both Righteous before God.* —— Heb. 11. 4, 7. *By Faith* Abel *offered to God a more excellent Sacrifice than* Cain, *by which he obtained witneſs that he was righteous, God teſtifying of his Gifts. By Faith* Noah *being warned of God of things not ſeen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an Ark,* —— *by which he became heir of the Righteouſneſs by Faith,* 1 Pet. 4. 18. *If the Righteous be ſcarcely ſaved.* —— Math. 10. 41. *He that receiveth a Righteous man in the name of a Righteous man, ſhall have a Righteous mans reward.* —— 1 Tim. 1. 9. *The Law is not made for a Righteous man, but for*—— Many ſcore of texts more mention a Righteouſneſs diſtinct from that of Chriſt imputed to us.

Judg now, Whether he that believeth God ſhould believe that he Imputeth Chriſts Obedience and Suffering to us, [for our *Sole Righteouſneſs.*]

That which is not our *ſole Righteouſneſs*, is not ſo Reputed by God nor Imputed: But Chriſts Obedience and Suffering is not our *ſole Righteouſneſs.* —— See *Davenant's* many arguments to prove that we have an Inherent Righteouſneſs.

Obj. *But*, they mean, [*our Sole Righteouſneſs by which we are Juſtified.*]

Anſw. 1. We can tell no mans meaning but by his words, eſpecially not contrary to them, eſpecially in an accurate Declaration of Faith. 2. Suppoſe it had been ſo ſaid, we maintain on the contrary, 1. That

That we are Juſtified by more ſorts of Righteouſneſs than one, in ſeveral reſpects. We are juſtified *only by Chriſts Righteouſneſs* as the Purchaſing and Meritorious Cauſe of our Juſtification freely given by that new Covenant. We are Juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of God the Father, as performing his Covenant with Chriſt and us, (efficiently). We are juſtified efficiently by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt as our Judg, paſſing a juſt ſentence according to his Covenant: Theſe laſt are neither *Ours* nor Imputed to us: But we are juſtified alſo againſt the Accuſation, of being finally Impenitent Unbelievers or unholy, by the perſonal particular Righteouſneſs of our own Repentance, *Faith and Holineſs*.

For 2. We ſay, that there is an univerſal Juſtification or Righteouſneſs, and there is a particular one. And this *particular* one may be the *Condition* and *Evidence* of our Title to all the reſt. And this is our caſe. The Day of Judgment is not to try and *Judg Chriſt*, or *his Merits, but us*: He will judg us himſelf by his new Law or Covenant, the ſum of which is, [*Except ye Repent, ye ſhall all periſh: and, He that believeth, ſhall be ſaved: and he that believeth not, ſhall be condemned.* If we be not accuſed of *Impenitence* or *Unbelief*, but only of *not-fulfilling the Law of Innocency*, that will ſuppoſe that we are to be *tryed* only by *that Law*, which is not true: And then we *refer the Accuſer only to Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*, and to the *Pardoning Law of Grace*, and to nothing in our ſelves to anſwer that charge; And ſo it would be *Chriſt's part* only that would be judged. But *Matth.* 25. and all the Scripture aſſureth us of the contrary, that it's *Our part that it is to be tryed* and *judged*, and that we ſhall

ſhall be all judged according to what we have done. And no man is in danger there of any other accuſation, but that he did not truly *Repent* and *Believe*, and live *a holy life to Chriſt*: And ſhall the *Penitent Believer* ſay, *I did never Repent and Believe, but Chriſt did it for me*; and ſo uſe *two Lyes*, one of Chriſt, and another of himſelf, that he may be juſtified? Or ſhall the *Unholy, Impenitent Infidel* ſay, It's true I was never a *Penitent Believer, or holy*, but Chriſt was for me, or Chriſts Righteouſneſs is my ſole Righteouſneſs? that is a falſhood; For Chriſts Righteouſneſs is none of his. So that there is a *particular perſonal Righteouſneſs*, conſiſting in *Faith and Repentance*, which by way of *Condition* and *Evidence* of our title to Chriſt and his Gift of Pardon and Life, is of abſolute neceſſity in our Juſtification. Therefore Imputed Righteouſneſs is not the *ſole Righteouſneſs* which muſt juſtifie us.

I cited abundance of plain Texts to this purpoſe in my Confeſſion, pag. 57. &c. Of which book I add, that when it was in the preſs, I procured thoſe three perſons whom I moſt highly valued for judgment, Mr. *Gataker*, (whoſe laſt work it was in this World) Mr. *Vines*, and laſtly Arch-Biſhop *Uſher* to read it over, except the Epiſtles (Mr. *Gataker* read only to *pag.* 163.) and no one of them adviſed me to alter one word, nor ſignified their diſſent to any word of it. But I have been long on this: to proceed in the Hiſtory. ——

The ſame year that I wrote that book, that moſt Judicious excellent man *Joſhua Placæus* of *Saumours* in *France*, was exerciſed in a Controverſie conjunct with this; How far *Adams* ſin is imputed to us. And to ſpeak truth, at firſt in the *Theſes Salmurienſ.*

Vol.

Vol. 1. he ſeemed plainly to diſpute againſt the Imputation of *Adam's* actual ſin, and his arguments I elſewhere anſwer.) And *Andr. Rivet* wrote a Collection of the Judgment of all ſorts of Divines for the contrary. But after he vindicated himſelf, & ſhewed that his Doctrine was, that *Adam's fact* is not *immediately* imputed to each of us, as if our *perſons* as *perſons* had been all fully repreſented in *Adam's* perſon (by an arbitrary Law or Will of God) or reputed ſo to be: But that our Perſons being *Virtually* or *Seminally* in *him*, we derive from him firſt our *Perſons*, and in them a corrupted nature, and that nature corrupted and juſtly deſerted by the Spirit of God, becauſe it is derived from *Adam* that ſo ſinned: And ſo that *Adams* fact is imputed to us mediately, *mediante natura & Corruptione*, but not primarily and immediately.

This doctrine of the Good and Judicious man was thought too new to eſcape ſharp cenſures, ſo that a rumour was ſpread abroad that he denied all Imputation of *Adams* fact, and placed original guilt only in the Guilt of Coruption, for which indeed he gave occaſion. A Synod being called at *Charenton*, this opinion without naming any Author was condemned, & all Miniſters required to ſubſcribe it: *Amyraldus* being of *Placeus* mind, in a ſpeech of two hours vindicated his opinion. *Placeus* knowing that the Decree did not touch him, took no notice of it. But *Geriſſolius* of *Montauban* wrote againſt him, pretending him condemned by the Decree, which *Drelincourt* one that drew it up, denied, profeſſing himſelf of *Placeus* his judgment. And *Rivet* alſo, *Mareſius*, *Carol. Daubuz* and others, miſunderſtanding him wrote againſt him.

For my part I confeſs that I am not ſatisfied in his diſtinction of *Mediate* and *Immediate Imputation:* I ſee not, but our *Perſons* as derived from *Adam*, being ſuppoſed to be in Being, we are at once Reputed to be ſuch as Virtually ſinned in him, and ſuch as are deprived of God's Image. And if either muſt be put firſt, me-thinks it ſhould rather be the former, we being therefore deprived of God's Immage (not by God, but by *Adam*) becauſe he ſinned it away from himſelf. It ſatisfieth me much more, to diſtinguiſh of our *Being* and ſo *ſinning* in *Adam Perſonally* and *Seminally*, or *Virtually*: we were not *Perſons* in *Adam* when he ſinned; therefore we did not ſo ſin in him: And it is a fiction added to God's Word, to ſay that God (becauſe he would do it) reputed us to be what we were not. But we were Seminally in *Adam* as in *Cauſâ naturali*, who was to produce us out of his very eſſence: And therefore that kind of being which we had in him, could not be innocent when he was guilty: And when we had our *Natures* and *Perſons* from him, we are juſtly reputed to be as we are, the offſpring of one that actually ſinned: And ſo when our *Exiſtence* and *Perſonality* maketh us capable Subjects, we are guilty *Perſons* of his ſin; though not with ſo *plenary a ſort of Guilt as he*.

And I fear not to ſay, that as I lay the ground of this Imputation in Nature it ſelf, ſo I doubt not but I have elſewhere proved that there is more participation of all Children in the guilt of their parents ſins by nature, than is ſufficiently acknowledged or lamented by moſt, though Scripture abound with the proof of it: And that the overlooking it, and laying all upon God's arbitrary Covenant

venant and Imputation, is the great temptation to *Pelagians* to deny Original ſin: And that our miſery no more increaſeth by it, is, becauſe we are now under a Covenant that doth not ſo charge all culpability on mankind, as the Law of Innocency did alone. And there is ſomething of Pardon in the Caſe. And the *Engliſh Litany*, (after *Ezra*, *Daniel* and others) well prayeth, Remember not, Lord, our offences, nor the offences of our Foreſathers, &c.

This ſame *Placeus* in *Theſ. Salmurienſ. Vol.* 1. hath opened the doctrine of Juſtification ſo fully, that I think that one Diſputation might ſpare ſome the reading of many contentious Volumes.

The rigid aſſertors of Imputation proved ſuch a ſtumbling-block to many, that they run into the other extreme, and not only denyed it, but vehemently loaded it with the Charges of over-throwing all Godlineſs and Obedience. Of theſe *Parker* (as is ſaid) with ſome others wrote againſt it in an anſwer to the Aſſemblies Confeſſion: Dr. *Gell* often reproacheth it in a large Book in *Folio*. And laſtly and moſt ſharply and confidently *Herbert Thorndike*, (to mention no more.)

The Hiſtory of this Controverſie of Imputation, I conclude, though diſorderly, with the ſenſe of all the Chriſtian Churches, in the Creeds and Harmony of Confeſſions, becauſe they were too long to be fitly inſerted by the way.

The Consent of Christians, and specially Protestants, about the Imputation of Christs Righteousness in Justification; How far and in what sence it is Imputed.

I. SEeing *Baptism* is our visible initiation into Christianity, we must there begin; and see what of this is there contained. Mat. 28. 19. *Baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, Mar. 16. 16. *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved*, Act 2. 38. *Repent, and be Baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the Remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.* See Acts 8. 36, 37, 38. The Eunuch's Faith and Baptism. Act. 22. 16. *Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, having called on the name of the Lord.* Rom. 6. 3. *So many as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death.* Gal. 3. 27. *As many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.* 1. Pet. 3. 21. *The like whereunto, Baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good Conscience towards God) by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.* Rom. 4. 24, 25. *But for us also to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead: who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our Justification.* [Quær. *How far Christ's Resurrection is imputed to us.*]

II. The Creed, called by the Apostles, hath but [*I believe —— the forgiveness of sins.*]

III. The Nicene and Constantinopolitane Creed,

I acknowledg one Baptiſm for the Remiſſion of ſins, (Chriſt's Death, Burial, and Reſurrection premiſed.)

IV. Athanaſius's Creed [*Who ſuffered for our Salvation, deſcended into Hell, roſe again the third day. —— At whoſe coming all men ſhall riſe again with their bodies, and ſhall give account for their own works; and they that have done good, ſhall go into everlaſting life, and they that have done evil into everlaſting Fire.*] (*Remiſſion* is contained in *Salvation.*)

V. The Fathers ſence I know not where the Reader can ſo eaſily and ſurely gather, without reading them all, as in *Laurentius* his Collection *de Juſtif.* after the *Corpus Confeſſionum*; and that to the beſt advantage of the Proteſtant Cauſe. They that will ſee their ſence of ſo much as they accounted neceſſary to Salvation, may beſt find it in their Treatiſes of Baptiſm, and Catechizings of the Catechumens; Though they ſay leſs about our Controverſie than I could wiſh they had. I will have no other Religion than they had. The Creed of *Damaſus* in *Hieron. op. Tom.* 2. hath but (*In his Death and Blood we believe that we are cleanſed —— and have hope that we ſhall obtain the reward of good merit,* (meaning our own); which the *Helvetians* own in the end of their Confeſſion.

VI. The Auguſtane Confeſſion, Art. 3, 4. *Chriſt died —— that he might reconcile the Father to us, and be a ſacrifice, not only for original ſin, but alſo for all the actual ſins of men. —— And that we may obtain theſe benefits of Chriſt, that is, Remiſſion of ſins, juſtification and life eternal, Chriſt gave us the Goſpel in which theſe benefits are propounded. —— To preach*

Repentance in his Name, and Remiſſion of ſins among all Nations. For when men propagated in the natural manner have ſin, and cannot truly ſatisfie Gods Law, the Goſpel reproveth ſin, and ſheweth us Chriſt the Mediator, and ſo teacheth us about Pardon of ſins——That freely for Chriſt's ſake are given us, Remiſſion of ſins, & Juſtification by Faith, by which we muſt confeſs that theſe are given us for Chriſt, who was made a Sacrifice for us, and appeaſed the Father. Though the Goſpel require Penitence; yet that pardon of ſin may be ſure, it teacheth us that it is freely given us; that is, that it dependeth not on the Condition of our worthyneſs, nor is given for any precedent works, or worthyneſs of following works. —— For Conſcience in true fears findeth no work which it can oppoſe to the Wrath of God; and Chriſt is propoſed and given us, to be a propitiator. This honour of Chriſt muſt not be transferred to our works. Therefore Paul *ſaith, ye are ſaved freely, (or of Grace.) And it is of grace, that the promiſe might be ſure; that is, Pardon will be ſure; when we know that it dependeth not on the Condition of our worthineſs, but is given for Chriſt. —— In the Creed this Article [I believe the Forgiveneſs of ſins,] is added to the hiſtory: And the reſt of the hiſtory of Chriſt muſt be referred to this Article: For this benefit is the end of the hiſtory, Chriſt therefore ſuffered and roſe again, that for him might be given us Remiſſion of ſins, and life everlaſting.*

Art. 6. *When we are Reconciled by Faith, there muſt needs follow the Righteouſneſs of good works.—— But becauſe the infirmity of mans nature is ſo great, that no man can ſatisfie the Law, it is neceſſary to teach men, not only that they muſt obey the Law, but alſo how this Obedience pleaſeth, leſt Conſciences fall into*

into desperation, when they understand that they satisfie not the Law. This Obedience then pleaseth, not because it satisfieth the Law, but because the person is in Christ, reconciled by Faith, and believeth that the relicts of his Sin are pardoned. We must ever hold that we obtain remission of sins, and the person is pronounced Righteous, that is, is accepted freely for Christ, by Faith: And afterward that Obedience to the Law pleaseth, and is reputed a certain Righteousness, and meriteth rewards.] Thus the first Protestants.

VII. The 11th Article of the Church of England (to which we all offer to subscribe) is [*Of the Justification of Man. We are accounted Righteous before God, only for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith; and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholsome doctrine, and very full of Comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.*]

The said Homilies (of Salvation and Faith) say over and over the same thing. As pag. 14. [*Three things go together in our Justification: On Gods part his great Mercy and Grace, on Christs part, Justice, that is the Satisfaction of Gods Justice, or the Price of our Redemption, by the offering of his body, and shedding of his blood, with fulfilling of the Law perfectly and throughly; And on our part true and lively Faith in the Merits of Jesus Christ: which yet is not ours, but by Gods working in us.*

And pag. [*A lively Faith is not only the common belief of the Articles of our Faith, but also a true trust and confidence of the mercy of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, and a steadfast hope of all good things to be received at Gods hand; and that although we through*

infirmity or temptation —— do fall from him by sin, yet if we return again to him by true repentance, that he will forgive and forget our offences, for his Sons sake our Saviour Jesus Christ, and will make us inheritors with him of his everlasting Kingdom —— Pag. 23. *For the very sure and lively Christian Faith, is, to have an earnest trust and confidence in God, that he doth regard us, and is careful over us, as the Father is over the Child whom he doth love; and that he will be merciful unto us, for his only Sons sake; and that we have our Saviour Christ our perpetual Advocate and Prince, in whose only merits, oblation and suffering, we do trust that our offences be continually washed and purged, whensoever we repenting truely do return to him with our whole heart, steadfastly determining with our selves, through his grace to obey and serve him, in keeping his Commandments, &c.*] So also the Apology. This is our doctrine of Imputation.

VIII. The Saxon Confession oft insisteth on the *free Pardon of sin, not merited by us, but by Christ.* And expoundeth *Justification* to be [*Of unjust, that is, Guilty and disobedient, and not having Christ: to be made Just, that is, To be Absolved from Guilt for the Son of God, and an apprehender by Faith of Christ himself, who is our* Righteousness; (as *Jeremiah* and *Paul* say) *because by his Merit we have forgiveness, and God imputeth righteousness to us, and for him, reputeth us just, and by giving us his Spirit quickeneth and regenerateth us.* —— *By being Justified by Faith alone we mean, that freely for our Mediator alone, not for our Contrition, or other Merits, the pardon of sin and reconciliation is given us.* —— *And before, It is certain, when the mind is raised by this Faith, that the pardon of sin, Reconciliation and Imputation of Righte-*

ousness

ouſneſs, are given for the Merit of Chriſt himſelf —. And after [*By Faith is meant Affiance, reſting in the Son of God the Propitiator, for whom we are received and pleaſe* (God) *and not for our virtues and fulfilling of the Law.*

IX. The Wittenberge Confeſſion, (In Corp. Conf. pag. 104) *A man is made Accepted of God, and Reputed juſt before him, for the Son of God our Lord Jeſus Chriſt alone, by Faith. And at the Judgment of God we muſt not truſt to the Merit of any of the Virtues which we have, but to the ſole Merit of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is made ours by Faith. And becauſe at the bar of God, where the caſe of true eternal Righteouſneſs and Salvation will be pleaded, there is no place for mans Merits, but only for God's Mercy, and the Merits of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, whom we receive by Faith: therefore we think our Anceſtors ſaid rightly, that we are juſtified before God by Faith only.*

X. The Bohemian Confeſſion, making Juſtification the principal Article, goeth the ſame way. [Pag. 183, 184. *By Chriſt men are Juſtified, obtain Salvation and Remiſſion of ſin freely by Faith in Chriſt, through mercy, without any Work and Merit of man. And his death and blood alone is ſufficient, to aboliſh & expiate all the ſins of all men. All muſt come to Chriſt for pardon and Remiſſion of Sin, Salvation and every thing. All our truſt and hope is to be faſtened on him alone. Through him only and his merits God is appeaſ'd and propitious, Loveth us, and giveth us Life eternal.*

XI. The Palatinate Confeſſion ib. pag. 149. [*I believe that God the Father for the moſt full Satisfaction of Chriſt, doth never remember any of my ſins, and that pravity which I muſt ſtrive againſt while I live, but contrarily will rather of grace give me the righteouſneſs*

neſs of Chriſt, ſo that I have no need to fear the judgment of God. —— *And* pag. 155. *If he merited, and obtained Remiſſion of all our ſins, by the only and bitter paſſion, and death of the Croſs, ſo be it we embracing it by true Faith, as the ſatisfaction for our ſins, apply it to our ſelves.* ——] I find no more of this.

XII. The Polonian Churches of Lutherans and Bohemians agreed in the Auguſtane and Bohemian Confeſſion before recited.

XIII. The Helvetian Confeſſion, [*To Juſtifie ſignifieth to the Apoſtle in the diſpute of Juſtification, To Remit ſins, to Abſolve from the fault and puniſhment, to Receive into favour, and to Pronounce juſt.*—— *For Chriſt took on himſelf, and took away the ſins of the World, and ſatisfied Gods Juſtice. God therefore for the ſake of Chriſt alone, ſuffering and raiſed again, is propitious to our ſins, and imputeth them not to us, but imputeth the righteouſneſs of Chriſt for ours; ſo that now we are not only cleanſed and purged from ſins, or Holy, but alſo endowed with the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and ſo abſolved from ſins, Death and Condemnation, and are righteous and heirs of life eternal. Speaking properly, God only juſtifieth us, and juſtifieth only for Chriſt, not imputing to us ſins, but imputing to us his Righteouſneſs.*] This Confeſſion ſpeaketh in terms neereſt the oppoſed opinion: But indeed ſaith no more than we all ſay; Chriſts Righteouſneſs being given and imputed to us as the *Meritorious Cauſe of our pardon and right to life.*

XIV. The Baſil Confeſſion, Art. 9. [*We confeſs Remiſſion of ſins by Faith in Jeſus Chriſt crucified. And though this Faith work continually by Love, yet Righteouſneſs and Satisfaction for our Sins, we do not attribute to works, which are fruits of Faith; but only*

ly to true affiance & faith in the bloodſhed of the Lamb of God. We ingenuouſly profeſs, that in Chriſt, who is our Righteouſneſs, Holineſs, Redemption, Way, Truth, Wiſdom, Life, all things are freely given us. The works therefore of the faithful are done, not that they may ſatisfie for their ſins, but only that by them, they may declare that they are thankful to God for ſo great benefits given us in Chriſt.

XV. The Argentine Confeſſion of the four Cities, Cap. 3. ib. pag. 179. hath but this hereof: *When heretofore they delivered, that a mans own proper Works are required to his Juſtification, we teach that this is to be acknowledged wholly received of God's benevolence and Chriſt's Merit, and perceived only by Faith. C. 4. We are ſure that no man can be made Righteous or ſaved, unleſs he love God above all, and moſt ſtudiouſly imitate him. We can no otherwiſe be Juſtified, that is, become both Righteous and Saved (for our Righteouſneſs is our very Salvation) than if we being firſt indued with Faith, by which believing the Goſpel, and perſwaded that God hath adopted us as Sons, and will for ever give us his fatherly benevolence, we wholly depend on his beck* (or will.)

XVI. The Synod of Dort, mentioneth only Chriſts death for the pardon of ſin and Juſtification. The Belgick Confeſſion, § 22. having mentioned Chriſt and his merits made ours, § 23. addeth, (*We believe that our bleſſedneſs conſiſteth in Remiſſion of our ſins for Jeſus Chriſt; and that our Righteouſneſs before God is therein contained, as* David *and* Paul *teach; We are juſtified freely, or by Grace, through the Redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus. We hold this Foundation firm, and give all the Glory to God—preſuming nothing of our ſelves, and our merits,*

but

but we rest on the sole Obedience of a Crucified Christ; which is ours when we believe in him.] Here you see in what sence they hold that Christs merits are ours; Not to justifie us by the Law, that saith, (*Obey perfectly and Live*) but as the merit of our *pardon*, which they here take for their whole Righteousness.

XVII. The Scottish Confession, Corp. Conf. pag. 125. hath but [that true Believers *receive in this life Remission of Sins, and that by Faith alone in Christs blood: So that though sin remain —— yet it is not Imputed to us, but is remitted, and covered by Christs Righteousness.*] This is plain and past all question.

XVIII. The French Confession is more plain, § 18. ib. pag. 81. [*We believe that our whole Righteousness lyeth in the pardon of our sins; which is also as* David *witnesseth our only blessedness. Therefore all other reasons by which men think to be justified before God, we plainly reject; and all opinion of Merit being cast away, we rest only in the Obedience of Christ, which is Imputed to us, both that all our sins may be covered, and that we may get Grace before God.*] So that Imputation of Obedience, they think is but for *pardon of sin, and acceptance.*

Concerning Protestants Judgment of Imputation, it is further to be noted; 1. That they are not agreed whether Imputation of Christ's perfect Holiness and Obedience, be before or after the Imputation of his Passion in order of nature. Some think that our sins are first in order of nature done away by the Imputation of his sufferings, that we may be free from punishment; and next, that his *perfection* is Imputed to us, to merit the Reward of life eternal: But the most learned Confuters of the Papists

piſts hold, that Imputation of Chriſts *Obedience* and *Suffering* together, are in order of nature before our Remiſſion of ſin and Acceptance, as the meritorious cauſe: And theſe can mean it in no other ſence than that which I maintain. So doth *Davenant* de Juſt. hab. et act. & Pet. Molinæus Theſ. Sedan. Vol. 1. pag. 625. *Imputatio juſtitiæ Chriſti propter quam peccata remittuntur, & cenſemur juſti coram Deo.* Mareſius Theſ. Sedan. Vol. 2. pag. 770, 771. § 6 & 10. *maketh the material cauſe of our Juſtification to be the Merits and Satisfaction of Chriſt, yea the Merit of his Satisfaction, and ſo maketh the formal Cauſe of Juſtification to be the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, or which is the ſame, the ſolemn Remiſſion of all ſins, and our free Acceptance with God.* Note that he maketh *Imputation* to be the ſame thing with *Remiſſion and Acceptance*; which is more than the former ſaid.

2. Note, that when they ſay that Imputation is the *Form* of Juſtification, they mean not of Juſtification Paſſively as it is ours, but Actively as it is *Gods Juſtifying act*, ſo *Mareſius ibidem.* And many deny it to be the form: And many think that ſaying improper.

3. Note, that it is ordinarily agreed by Proteſtants, that Chriſts Righteouſneſs is imputed to us in the ſame ſence as our ſins are ſaid to be imputed to him; (even before they are committed many Ages;) which cleareth fully the whole Controverſie to thoſe that are but willing to underſtand, and blaſpheme not Chriſt; ſo *Mareſius ubi ſupra: Quemadmodum propter deliquia noſtra ei imputata punitus fuit Chriſtus in terris; ita & propter ejus Juſtitiam nobis imputatam coronamur in Cælis.* And *Job. Crocius*

Crocius Disput. 10. p. 502. And *Vasseur* in his solid Disp. *Thes. Sedan. Vol.* 2. pag. 1053, 1054. While he mentioneth only *Satisfaction* for our Justification, yet § 27. saith that *Satisfaction* is *imputed to us*, and placeth Christs Imputed Righteousness in his Obedience *to the* death; and saith that this *Satisfying Obedience*, *in suffering*, is our Imputed Righteousness. *Ea igitur Obedientia Christi qua Patri paruit usque ad mortem crucis, qua coram Patre comparuit ut voluntatem ejus perficeret, qua a Patre missus, ut nos sui sanguinis effusione redimeret, justitiæ ejus pro peccatis nostris abunde satisfecit; ea inquam obedientia ex gratia Patris imputata & donata, illa justitia est qua justificamur.* And they ordinarily use the similitude of the Redemption of a Captive, and Imputing the Price to him. He addeth (*Hence we may gather that as Christ was made sin, so we are made the Righteousness of God, that is by Imputation*] which is true.

The plain truth in all this is within the reach of every sound Christian, and self-conceited wranglers make difficulties where there are none. Yea, how far the Papists themselves grant the Protestant doctrine of Imputation, let the following words of *Vasseur* on *Bellarmine* be judg. [*Bellarm. ait; Si solum vellent hæretici nobis imputari Merita Christi, quia nobis donata sunt, & possumus ea Deo Patri offerre pro peccatis nostris, quoniam Christus suscepit super se onus satisfaciendi pro nobis, nosque Deo Patri reconciliandi, recta esset eorum Sententia*: I doubt some will say, it is false, because *Bellarmine* granteth it; but *Vasseur* addeth [*Hæc ille: sed an nostra longe abest ab illâ, quam in nobis requireret sententia.*] And I wish the Reader that loveth Truth and Peace

to

to read the words of *Pighius*, *Caſſander*, *Bellarmine*, &c. ſaying as the Proteſtants, cited by *Joh. Crocius de Juſtificat. Diſput. 9. pag.* 458. &c. And of *Morton Apolog.* eſpecially *Tho. Waldenſis.*

Nazianzen's ſentence prefixed by the great *Baſil*-Doctors to their Confeſſion, I do affectionately recite, [*Sacred Theologie and Religion is a ſimple and naked thing; conſiſting of Divine Teſtimonies without any great artifice: which yet ſome do naughtily turn into a moſt difficult Art.*

The Hiſtory of the *Socinians* oppoſing Chriſts *Satisfaction* and *Merits* I overpaſs, as being handled by multitudes of Writers.

If any impartial man would not be troubled with needleſs tedious writings, and yet would ſee the Truth clearly, about Juſtification and Imputation, in a very little room, let him read, 1. Mr. *Bradſhaw*, 2. Mr. *Gibbon's* Sermon in the Exerciſes at *Giles's* in the Fields. 3. Mr. *Truman's* great Propitiation. 4. *Joſhua Placeus*, his *Diſput. de Juſtif.* in *Theſ. Salmur. Vol.* 1. 5. And *Le Blank's* late *Theſes*; Which will ſatisfie thoſe that have any juſt capacity for ſatisfaction. And if he add *Wotton de Reconciliatione*, and *Grotius de Satisfactione*, he need not loſe his labour: no nor by reading *John Goodwin* of Juſtification, though every word be not approveable. And Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Sermons of Satisfaction, coming laſt, will alſo conduce much to his juſt information.

So much of the Hiſtorical part.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the true ſtating of the Controverſie, and the explication of the ſeveral points contained or meerly implyed in it.

I take explication to be here more uſeful than argumentation: And therefore I ſhall yet fullier open to you the ſtate of our differences, and my own judgment in the point, with the reaſons of it, in ſuch neceſſary Diſtinctions, and brief Propoſitions, as ſhall carry their own convincing light with them. If any think I diſtinguiſh too much, let him prove any to be needleſs *or* unjuſt, *and then reject it and ſpare not. If any think I diſtinguiſh not accurately enough, let him add what is wanting, and but ſuppoſe that I have elſewhere done it, and am not now handling the whole doctrine of Juſtification, but only that of Imputation, and what it neceſſarily includeth.*

THough a man that readeth our moſt Learned Proteſtants, profeſſing that they agree even with *Bellarmine* himſelf in the ſtating of the caſe of Imputation, would think that there ſhould need no further ſtating of it. I cited you *Bellarmine's* words

words before with *Vaſſeurs* conſent: I here add Johan. Crocius de Juſtif. Diſp. 10. pag. 500. 501. *Vide hominis ſive vertiginem ſive improbitatem, clamat fieri non poſſe ut Juſtitia Chriſti nobis imputetur eo ſenſu qui hæreticis probetur —— Et tamen rectam vocat ſententiam, quam ſuam faciunt Evangelici. Quod enim cum rectâ ratione pugnare dicit, nos per Juſtitiam Chriſti formaliter juſtos nominari & eſſe, nos non tangit: Non dicimus; Non ſentimus: Sed hoc totum proficiſcitur e Sophiſtarum officinâ, qui phraſin iſtam nobis affingunt, ut poſtea eam exagitent tanquam noſtram:* (yet ſome of our own give them this pretence.) *Nos ſententiam quam ille rectam judicat, tenemus, tuemur; ſic tamen ut addamus, quod Genti adverſariæ eſt intolerabile, non alia ratione nos juſtos cenſeri coram Deo.*] But by Juſtification the Papiſts mean Sanctification: And they count it not intolerable to ſay that the penalty of our ſins is remitted to us, by that Satisfaction to the Juſtice of God according to the Law of Innocency, which Chriſt only hath made. But though many thruſt in more indeed, and moſt of them much more in words; yet you ſee they are forced to ſay as we ſay whether they will or not: For they ſeem unwilling to be thought to agree with us, where they agree indeed.] And the following words of *Joh. Crocius pag.* 506, 507. *&c.* ſhew the common ſence of moſt Proteſtants, [*When* Bellarmine *obſerveth that Imputation maketh us as righteous as Chriſt*, he ſaith, [*If we ſaid that we are Juſtified by Chriſts eſſential righteouſneſs. —— But we ſay it not. Yea above all we renounce that which the Sophiſter puts in of his own, even that which he ſaith of Formal Righteouſneſs: For it is not our opinion, that we are conſtituted formally Righteous by*

 Chriſt's

Christ's Righteousness, which we rather call the Material cause. —— § 32. *Christs satisfaction is made for all: But it is imputed to us, not as it is made for all, but as for us. I illustrate it by the like. The Kings Son payeth the debt of a Community deeply indebted to the King, and thence bound to perpetual slavery. This payment gets liberty for this, and that, and the other member of the Community: For it is imputed to them by the King as if they had paid it. But this Imputation transferreth not the honour to them, but brings them to partake of the Benefit. So when the price paid by Christ for all, is imputed to this or that man, he is taken into the society of the Benefit,* —— Pag. 503. *Distinguish between the Benefit, and the Office of Christ. The former is made ours, but not the latter,* ——Pag. 542. *The Remission of sin is nothing but the Imputation of Christs Righteousness.* Rom. 4. *Where Imputation of Righteousness, Remission of Iniquities, and non-imputation of sin, are all one,* —— Pag. 547. *God imputeth it as far as he pleaseth,* —— Pag. 548. *Princes oft impute the merits of Parents to unworthy Children,* —— Pag. 551. He denyeth that we have *Infinite Righteousness in Christ, because it is imputed to us in a finite manner, even so far as was requisite to our absolution.*

But I will a little more distinctly open and resolve the Case.

1. We must distinguish of *Righteousness* as it relateth to the Preceptive part of the Law; and as it relateth to the Retributive part: The first *Righteousness*, is *Innocency* contrary to *Reatus Culpæ*: The second is *Jus ad impunitatem & ad præmium (seu donum,) Right to Impunity and to the Reward.*

2. We must distinguish of *Christs Righteousness*, which

which is either ſo called, *formally* and *properly*, which is the *Relation of Chriſts perſon* to his *Law of Mediation* impoſed on him, 1. As *Innocent* and a perfect obeyer; 2. As one that *deſerved not puniſhment, but deſerved Reward*. Or it is ſo called *materially* and *improperly*; which is, Thoſe *ſame Habits, Acts and Sufferings* of Chriſt, from which *his Relation* of *Righteous* did reſult.

3. We muſt diſtinguiſh of *Imputation*, which ſignifyeth (here) 1. To repute us *perſonally* to have been the *Agents of Chriſts Acts*, the *ſubjects* of his *Habits and Paſſion* in a Phyſical ſence. 2. Or to repute the ſame *formal Relation* of *Righteouſneſs* which was in Chriſts perſon, to be in *ours* as the *ſubject*. 3. Or to repute us to have been the very *ſubjects of Chriſt's Habits and Paſſion*, and the Agents of his *Acts* in a *Political* or *Moral ſenſe*, (and not a phyſical); as a man payeth a debt by his Servant, or Attorney, or Delegate. 4. And conſequently to repute a *double formal Righteouſneſs* to reſult from the ſaid *Habits*, *Acts*, and *Paſſions*; one to *Chriſt* as the *natural Subject* and *Agent*, and *another to us* as the *Moral*, *Political*, or *reputed Subject* and *Agent* (And ſo his *Formal Righteouſneſs* not to be imputed to us *in it ſelf as ours*, but *another* to reſult from the ſame *Matter*.) 5. Or elſe that we are reputed both the *Agents* and *Subjects* of the *Matter* of his Righteouſneſs, morally, and alſo of the *Formal Righteouſneſs* of *Chriſt himſelf*. 6. Or elſe by Imputation is meant here, that Chriſt being truly reputed to have taken the Nature of ſinful man, and become a Head for all true Believers, in that undertaken *Nature* and *Office* in the *Perſon* of a *Mediator*, to have fulfilled *all the Law impoſed on him*, by perfect *Holineſs*

and *Obedience*, and *Offering* himſelf on the Croſs a *Sacrifice for our ſins*, voluntarily ſuffering in our ſtead, as if he had been a ſinner, (guilty of all our ſins) As ſoon as we believe we are pardoned, juſtified, adopted for *the ſake and merit* of this Holineſs, Obedience and penal Satisfaction of Chriſt, with as full demonſtration of divine *Juſtice*, at leaſt, and more full demonſtration of his *Wiſdom* and *Mercy*, than if we had ſuffered our ſelves what our ſins deſerved (that is, been damned) or had never ſinned: And ſo *Righteouſneſs is imputed to us*, that is, *we are accounted or reputed righteous*, (not in relation to the Precept, that is, *innocent*, or *ſinleſs*, but in relation to the *Retribution*, that is, *ſuch as have Right to Impunity and Life*,) becauſe Chriſt's foreſaid perfect Holineſs, Obedience and Satisfaction, *merited our Pardon, and Adoption, and the Spirit*; or merited the *New-Covenant*, by which, as an Inſtrument, *Pardon, Juſtification and Adoption* are given to Believers, and the *Spirit* to be given to ſanctifie them: And when we believe, we are juſtly *reputed* ſuch as have *Right* to all theſe purchaſed Gifts.

4. And that it may be underſtood how far Chriſt did *Obey* or *Suffer* in our *ſtead*, or *perſon*, we muſt diſtinguiſh, 1. Between his taking the *Nature* of *ſinful* man, and taking the Perſon of ſinners. 2. Between his taking the *Perſon* of a *ſinner*, and taking the *Perſon* of *you* and *me*, and each particular ſinner. 3. Between his taking our ſinful perſons *ſimply*, *& ad omnia*, and taking them only, *ſecundum quid*, *in tantum*, *& ad hoc*. 4. Between his *ſuffering* in the *Perſon* of ſinners, and his *obeying* and *ſanctifying in the Perſon* of ſinners or of us in particular. 5. Between his *Obeying* and *Suffering* in *our Perſon*, and

and our *Obeying* and *Suffering* in his Perſon (*Natural or Political.*) And now I ſhall make uſe of theſe diſtinctions, by the Propoſitions following.

Prop. 1. The phraſe of [*Chriſt's Righteouſneſs imputed to us*] is not in the Scripture.

2. Therefore when it cometh to Diſputation, to them that deny it, ſome Scripture-phraſe ſhould be put in ſtead of it; becauſe, 1. The Scripture hath as good, if not much better, phraſes, to ſignifie all in this that is neceſſary. 2. And it is ſuppoſed that the Diſputants are agreed of all that is expreſs in the Scripture.

3. Yet ſo much is ſaid in Scripture, as may make this phraſe [*of Imputing Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to us*] juſtifiable, in the ſound ſence here explained: For the thing meant by it is true, and the phraſe intelligible.

4. Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed to Believers, in the ſixth ſence here before explained; As the Meritorious cauſe of our Pardon, Juſtification, Righteouſneſs, Adoption, Sanctification and Salvation, &c. as is opened.

5. Chriſt did not ſuffer all in kind (much leſs in duration) which ſinful man deſerved to ſuffer: As *e. g.* 1. He was not hated of God; 2. Nor deprived or deſerted of the ſanctifying Spirit, and ſo of its Graces and Gods Image; Nor had 3. any of that permitted penalty by which ſin it ſelf is a miſery and puniſhment to the ſinner. 4. He fell not under the Power of the Devil as a deceiver and ruler, as the ungodly do. 5. His Conſcience did not accuſe him of ſin, and torment him for it. 6. He did not totally deſpair of ever being ſaved. 7. The

fire of Hell did not torment his body. More such instances may be given for proof.

6. Christ did not perform all the same obedience in kind, which many men, yea all men, are or were bound to perform. As 1. He did not dress and keep that Garden which *Adam* was commanded to dress and keep. 2. He did not the conjugal offices which *Adam*, and millions more, were bound to. 3. Nor the Paternal Offices to Children. 4. Nor all the offices of a King on Earth, or Magistrate: nor of a Servant, &c. Nor the duty of the Sick. 5. He did not repent of sin, nor turn from it to God, nor mortifie or resist in himself any sinful lust; nor receive a Saviour by Faith, nor was circumcised or baptized for the Remission of his sins; nor loved God or thanked him for redeeming or pardoning him; nor obeyed God in the use of any Ordinance or Means, for the subduing of sin, and healing or saving of his Soul from any sin or deserved wrath of God; with much more such.

7. Christ did perform much which no man else was bound to do: As to redeem Souls, to work his Miracles and the rest of the works, peculiar to the Mediator.

8. That Law which bound us to Suffering, (or made it our due) bound not Christ to it, (as being innocent); But he was bound to it by the Fathers Law of Mediator, and by his own voluntary sponsion.

9. The Law obliging every sinner himself to suffer, was not *fulfilled* by the *Suffering* of Christ our Sponsor: But only the *Lawgiver satisfied* by attaining its Ends. For neither the letter nor sence of it said, [*If thou sin, thou or thy surety shall suffer.*]

10. Christ

10. Christ *satisfied Justice* and *obeyed* in *Humane Nature*, which also was *Holy* in him.

11. He did not this as a *Natural* Root, or Head to man, as *Adam* was; to convey *Holiness* or *Righteousness* by *natural propagation*, as *Adam* should have done; and did by sin: For Christ had no Wife or natural Children; But as a *Head by Contract* as a Husband to a Wife, and a King to a Kingdom, and a *Head of Spiritual Influx*.

12. No as being *Actually* such a Head to the Redeemed when he *Obeyed* and *Suffered*; but as a Head by *Aptitude* and *Office*, *Power* and *Virtue*, who was to *become a Head actually* to every one when they *Believed* and *Consented*; Being before a *Head for them*, and *over those that did exist*, but not a *Head to them*, in act.

13. Therefore they were not Christs members Political, (much less Natural) when he obeyed and died.

14. A Natural Head being but a *part of a person*, what it doth the *Person doth*. But seeing a *Contracted Head*, and all the *members* of his *Body Contracted* or *Politick*, are every one a *distinct Person*, it followeth not that each person did really or reputatively what the *Head did*. Nay it is a good consequence that [*If he did it as Head, they did it not* (numerically) as *Head* or *Members*.]

15. Christ *Suffered* and *Obeyed* in the Person of the Mediator between God and man; and as a *subject* to the Law of Mediation.

16. Christ may be said to suffer *in the person of a sinner*, as it meaneth *his own person reputed and used as* a *sinner* by his persecutors, and as he was one who stood before God as an Undertaker to suffer for Man's sin.

17. Christ

17. Christ suffered in the *place* and *stead* of *sinners*, that they might be delivered, though in the *person* of a *Sponsor*.

18. When we are agreed that the *Person* of the *Sponsor*, and of every *particular sinner* are divers; and that Christ had not suffered, if we had not sinned, and that he as a *Sponsor suffered in our stead*, and so bore the punishment, which *not he, but we deserved*; If any will here instead of a *Mediator* or *Sponsor* call him our *Representative*, and say that he suffered *even in all our Persons reputatively*, not *simpliciter*, but *secundum quid*, & *in tantum* only; that is, not representing our *Persons simply* and in all *respects*, and to *all ends*, but *only so far* as to be a *Sacrifice* for *our sins*, and suffer in our *place* and *stead* what he suffered; we take this to be but *lis de nomine*, a question about the *name* and *words*: And we will not oppose any man that thinketh those words fittest, as long as we agree in the matter signified. And so many Protestant Divines say that Christ suffered in the person of every sinner, (at least Elect,) that is, so far only and to such effects.

19. Christ did not suffer strictly, simply, absolutely, in the *person* of any one elect sinner, much less in the millions of persons of them all, in Law-sence, or in Gods esteem. God did not esteem Christ to be *naturally*, or as an *absolute Representer*, *David*, *Manasseh*, *Paul*, and every such other sinner, but only a Mediator that suffered in their stead.

20. God did make Christ *to be sin* for us; that is, A *Sacrifice for our sin*, and one that by *Man* was *reputed*, and by *God and Man* was *used*, as *sinners are*, and deserve to be.

21. Christ was not our *Delegate* in *Obeying* or *Suffering*;

Suffering: We did not commiſſion him, or depute him to do what he did in our ſtead: But he did it by God's Appointment and his own Will.

22. Therefore he did it on God's terms, and to what effects it pleaſed God, and not on our terms, nor to what effects we pleaſe.

23. God did not ſuppoſe or repute Chriſt, to have committed all or any of the ſins which we all committed, nor to have had all the wickedneſs in his nature which was in ours, nor to have deſerved what we deſerved: Nor did he in this proper ſence *impute our ſins* to Chriſt.

24. The falſe notion of God's ſtrict imputing all our ſins to Chriſt, and eſteeming him the greateſt ſinner in the World, being ſo great a Blaſphemy both againſt the Father and the Son, it is ſafeſt in ſuch Controverſies to hold to the plain and ordinary words of Scripture. And it is not the *Wiſdom* nor *Impartiality* of ſome men, who greatly cry up the Scripture-perfection, and decry the addition of a Ceremony or Form in the Worſhip of God; that yet think Religion is endangered, if our Confeſſion uſe not the phraſes of [*God's Imputing our ſin to Chriſt, and his Imputing Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to us*] when neither of them is in the Scripture; As if all God's Word were not *big* or *perfect* enough to make us a Creed or Confeſſion in ſuch phraſes as it is fit for Chriſtians to take up with: Countenancing the Papiſts, whoſe Faith is ſwelled to the many Volumes of the Councils, and no man can know how much more is to be added, and when we have all.

25. God doth not repute or account us to have *ſuffered* in our Natural perſons what Chriſt ſuffered for us, nor Chriſt to have ſuffered in our Natural perſons.

26. Though

26. Though Christ *suffered in our stead*, and in a large sence, to certain uses and in *some respects*, as the *Representer*, or in the *Persons* of sinners; yet did he not so far *represent* their persons in his *Habitual Holiness and Actual Obedience* (no not in the *Obedience* of his *Suffering*,) as he did in the *suffering it self*. He obeyed not in the *Person* of a *sinner*, much less of millions of sinners; which were to say, *In the person of sinners he never sinned*. He suffered, to save us from suffering; but he *obeyed not to save us from obeying*, but to bring us to Obedience. Yet his *Perfection* of *Obedience* had this *end*, that *perfect Obedience* might not be *necessary* in us to our Justification and Salvation.

27. It was not *we our selves* who did *perfectly obey*, or were *perfectly holy*, or suffered for sin in the *Person* of *Christ*, or by *Him*: Nor did we (*Naturally* or *Morally*) *merit* our own Salvation by obeying in Christ; nor did *we satisfie Gods Justice for our sins*, nor purchase pardon of Salvation to our selves, by our *Suffering* in and *by Christ*; All such phrase and sence is contrary to Scripture. But Christ did this for us.

28. Therefore God doth not repute us to have done it, seeing it is not true.

29. It is impossible for the *individual* formal *Righteousness* of Christ, to be our *Formal personal Righteousness*. Because it is a *Relation* and *Accident*, which cannot be translated from subject to subject, and cannot be in divers subjects the same.

30. Where the question is, Whether Christs *Material Righteousness*, that is, his *Habits*, *Acts* and *Sufferings* themselves, be *Ours*, we must consider how a man can have *Propriety in Habits*, *Acts and Passions*.

Paſſions who is the *ſubject* of them: and in *Actions*, who is the *Agent* of them. To *Give the ſame Individual Habit or Paſſion* to another, *in an Impoſſibility*, that is, to make him by Gift the ſubject of it. For it is not the ſame, if it be in another ſubject. To *make* one *man really* or *phyſically* to have been the *Agent* of *anothers Act*, even that *Individual Act*, if he was not ſo, is a contradiction and impoſſibility, that is, to make it true, that I did that which I did not. To be ours by *Divine Imputation*, cannot be, *to be ours by a falſe Reputation*, or ſuppoſition that we did what we did not: For God cannot err or lie. There is therefore but one of theſe two ways left, *Either that we our ſelves in perſon, truly had the habits which Chriſt had, and did all that Chriſt did, and ſuffered all that he ſuffered, and ſo ſatisfied and merited Life in and by him, as by an Inſtrument, or Legal Repreſenter of our perſons in all this*; Which I am anon to Confute: or elſe, That *Chriſts Satisfaction*, Righteouſneſs, and the *Habits*, *Acts* and *Sufferings* in which it lay, are imputed to us, and made ours; not rigidly in the very thing it ſelf, but in the *Effects* and *Benefits*; In as much as we are as really *Pardoned*, *Juſtified*, *Adopted* by them, as the Meritorious cauſe, by the inſtrumentality of the Covenants Donation, as if we our ſelves had done and ſuffered all that Chriſt did, as a Mediator and Sponſor, do and ſuffer for us: I ſay, As *really* and *certainly*, and with a fuller demonſtration of Gods Mercy and Wiſdom, and with a ſufficient demonſtration of his Juſtice. But not that our propriety in the benefits is in all reſpects the ſame, as it ſhould have been if we had *been, done, and ſuffered our ſelves* what Chriſt did. Thus Chriſts Righteouſneſs is ours.

31. Chriſt

31. Christ is truly *The Lord our Righteousness*; in more respects than one or two: 1. In that he is the *meritorious Cause* of the *Pardon of all our sins*, and our full Justification, Adoption, and right to Glory: and by his Satisfaction and Merits only, our Justification by the Covenant of Grace against the Curse of the Law of Works is purchased. 2. In that he is the Legislator, Testator and Donor of our Pardon, and Justification by this new-Testament or Covenant. 3. In that he is the Head of Influx, and King and Intercessor, by and from whom the *Spirit* is given, to sanctifie us to God, and cause us sincerely to perform the Conditions of the Justifying and saving Covenant, in Accepting and Improving the mercy then given. 4. In that he is the Righteous Judge and Justifyer of Believers by sentence of Judgment. In all these Respects he is *The Lord our Righteousness*.

32. We are said *to be made the Righteousness of God in him*: 1. In that, as he was *used like* a *sinner* for us, (but not esteemed one by God) so we are used *like Innocent persons* so far as to be *saved* by him. 2. In that through his *Merits*, and upon our *union with him*, when we believe and consent to his Covenant, we are *pardoned* and *justified*, and so made *Righteous* really, that is, such as are not to be *condemned* but to be glorified. 3. In that the *Divine Nature* and *Inherent Righteousness*, to them that are *in him by Faith*, are for his Merits, given by the Holy Ghost. 4. In that God's Justice and Holiness Truth, Wisdom, and Mercy, are all wonderfully demonstrated in this way of pardoning and justifying sinners by Christ. Thus are we made the Righteousness of God in him.

33. For

33. For *Righteouſneſs to be imputed to us*, is all one as to be accounted *Righteous*, Rom. 4. 6, 11. notwithſtanding that we be not Righteous as fulfillers of the Law of Innocency.

34. For *Faith to be imputed to us for Righteouſneſs*, Rom. 4. 22, 23, 24. is plainly meant, that God who under the Law of Innocency required perfect Obedience, of us to our Juſtification and Glorification, upon the *ſatisfaction* and *merits* of Chriſt, hath freely given a full *Pardon* and *Right* to *Life*, to all true Believers; ſo that now by the Covenant of Grace nothing is required *of us*, to our Juſtification, but *Faith*: all the reſt being done by Chriſt: And ſo Faith in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, is reputed truly to be the condition on our part, on which Chriſt and Life, by that Baptiſmal Covenant, are made ours.

35. Juſtification, Adoption, and Life eternal are conſidered; 1. *Quoad ipſam rem*, as to the thing it ſelf in value. 2. *Quoad, Ordinem Conferendi & Recipiendi*, as to the *order* and *manner* of *Conveyance* and *Participation*. In the firſt reſpect, *It is a meer free-gift to us, purchaſed by Chriſt*: In the ſecond reſpect, It is a *Reward* to Believers, who thankfully accept the free-Gift according to its nature and uſes.

36. It is an error contrary to the ſcope of the Goſpel to ſay, that *the Law of Works, or of Innocency*, doth juſtifie us, as performed either by our ſelves, or by Chriſt. For that Law condemneth and curſeth us; And we are not efficiently juſtified by it, but *from or againſt it*.

37. Therefore we have no Righteouſneſs in *Reality* or *Reputation formally ours*, which conſiſteth in

in the first *Species*; that is, in a *Conformity to the Preceptive part of the Law of Innocency*; we are not *reputed Innocent*: But only a Righteousness which consisteth in *Pardon of all sin, and right to life*, (with *sincere performance of the Condition of the Covenant of Grace*, that is, *True Faith.*)

38. Our pardon puts not away our *Guilt of Fact* or *Fault*, but our *Guilt of, or, obligation to Punishment.* God doth not repute us such as never sinned, or such as by our Innocency merited Heaven, but such as are not to be *damned*, but to be *glorified*, because *pardoned* and *adopted* through the Satisfaction and Merits of Christ.

39. Yet the *Reatus Culpæ* is remitted to us Relatively as to the punishment, though not in it self; that is, It shall not procure our Damnation: Even as Christ's Righteousness is, though not in it self, yet respectively as to the Benefits said to be *made ours*, in as much as we shall have those benefits by it.

40. Thus both the *Material* and the *Formal Righteousness* of *Christ are made ours*; that is, *Both* the *Holy Habits* and *Acts*, and his *Sufferings*, *with the Relative formal Righteousness of his own Person*, because these are altogether one Meritorious cause of our Justification, commonly called the Material Cause.

Obj. *But though Forma Denominat; yet if Christs Righteousness in Matter and Form, be the Meritorious Cause of ours, and that be the same with the Material Cause*, it is a *very tolerable speech to say, that His Righteousness is Ours in it self, while it is the very matter of ours.*

Ans. 1. When any man is *Righteous Immediately by* any

any action, that action is called *the Matter* of his *Righteouſneſs*, in ſuch an Analogical ſenſe as Action, an *Accident* may be called *Matter*, becauſe the *Relation* of Righteous is founded or ſubjected firſt or partly in that *Action*. And ſo when Chriſt perfectly *obeyed*, it was the *Matter of his Righteouſneſs*. But to be Righteous and to *Merit* are not all one notion: Merit is adventitious to meer Righteouſneſs. Now it is not Chriſts *Actions* in themſelves that our Righteouſneſs reſulteth from immediately as his own did; But there is firſt his *Action*, then his *formal Righteouſneſs thereby*; and *thirdly*, *his Merit* by that *Righteouſneſs* which goes to procure the *Covenant-Donation* of Righteouſneſs to us, by which Covenant we are *efficiently* made Righteous. So that the name of a *Material Cauſe* is much more properly given to *Chriſts Actions*, as to his *own formal Righteouſneſs*, than as to *ours*. But yet this is but *de nomine*.

2. Above all, conſider what that *Righteouſneſs* is which Chriſt merited for us, (which is the heart of the Controverſie.) It is not of the ſame *ſpecies* or ſort with his own. His Righteouſneſs was a perfect *ſinleſs Innocency*, and *Conformity* to the *preceptive part of the Law of Innocency in Holineſs*. Ours is not ſuch. The diſſenters think it is ſuch by *Imputation*, and here is the difference. Ours is but in reſpect to the *ſecond* or *retributive part* of the *Law*; a *Right to Impunity and Life*, *and a Juſtification* not at all *by that Law*, *but from its curſe or condemnation*. The Law that ſaith, *Obey perfectly and live*, *ſin and die*, doth not juſtifie us as perſons that have perfectly obeyed it, really or imputatively; But its *obligation to puniſhment is diſſolved*, not by it ſelf, but by the Law *of Grace*. It is then by the Law

of

of Grace that we are judged and justified. According to it, 1. We are not *really* or *reputatively such* as have *perfectly fulfilled* all *its Precepts*: 2. But we are such as by Grace do *sincerely perform* the *Condition* of its promise. 3. By which promise of Gift, we are such as have right to Christs own *person*, in the Relation and Union of a Head and Saviour, and with him the pardon of all our sins, and the *right of Adoption to the Spirit, and the Heavenly Inheritance* as *purchased by Christ*. So that besides our Inherent or Adherent Righteousness of sincere *Faith, Repentance and Obedience*, as the performed condition of the Law of Grace, we have no other Righteousness our selves, but *Right to Impunity and to Life*: and not any *imputed sinless Innocency* at all. God *pardoneth* our sins and *adopteth* us, for the sake of Christs sufferings and *perfect Holiness*: But he doth not account us *perfectly Holy* for it, nor *perfectly Obedient*. So that how-ever you will call it, *whether* a *Material Cause* or a *Meritorious*, the thing is plain.

Obj. *He is made of God Righteousness to us.*

Ans. True: But that's none of the question. But how is he so made? 1. As he is made Wisdom, Sanctification and Redemption as aforesaid. 2. By Merit, Satisfaction, Direction, Prescription and Donation. He is the Meritorious Cause of our Pardon, of our Adoption, of our Right to Heaven, of that new Covenant which is the Instrumental Deed of Gift, confirming all these: And he is also our Righteousness in the sense that *Austin* so much standeth on, as all our Holiness and Righteousness of Heart and Life, is not of our natural endeavour, but his gift, and operation by his Spirit; causing us

to

to obey his Holy precepts and Example. All theſe ways he is made of God our Righteouſneſs: Beſides the Objective way of ſenſe; as he is *Objectively* made our *Wiſdom*, becauſe it is the trueſt wiſdom to know him; So he is objectively made our *Righteouſneſs*, in that it is that Goſpel-Righteouſneſs which is required *of our ſelves*, by his grace, to believe in him and obey him.

41. Though Chriſt fulfilled not the Law by Habitual Holineſs and Actual Obedience, ſtrictly in the Individual perſon of each particular ſinner; yet he did it in the nature of Man: And ſo humane nature, (conſidered *in ſpecie*, and in Chriſt perſonally, though not conſidered as *a totum*, or as perſonally in each man,) did ſatisfie and fullfil the Law and Merit. As Humane Nature ſinned in *Adam* actually in *ſpecie*, and in his individual perſon, and all our *Perſons* were *ſeminally* and *virtually* in him, and accordingly ſinned, or are reputed ſinners, as having no nature but what he conveyed who could convey no better than he had (either as to Relation or Real quality): But not that God reputed us to have been *actually exiſtent*, as *really diſtinct perſons* in *Adam* (which is not true.) Even ſo Chriſt obeyed and ſuffered in our *Nature*, and in our nature as it was in him; and humane ſinful nature in *ſpecie* was Univerſally pardoned by him, and *Eternal life freely given to all men* for his merits, thus far imputed to them, their ſins being not imputed to hinder this Gift; which is made in and by the Covenant of Grace: Only the Gift hath the Condition of mans Acceptance of it according to its nature, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19, 20. And all the individuals that ſhall in time by Faith accept the Gift, are there and thereby made

ſuch as the Covenant for his merits doth juſtifie, by that General Gift.

42. As *Adam* was a Head by *Nature*, and therefore conveyed Guilt by natural Generation; ſo Chriſt is a Head (not by nature but) by Sacred Contract; and therefore conveyeth Right to Pardon, Adoption and Salvation, not by Generation, but by Contract, or Donation. So that what it was to be *naturally* in *Adam*, ſeminally and virtually, though not perſonlly in exiſtence; even that it is, in order to our benefit by him to be *in Chriſt by Contract or the new Covenant*, virtually, though not in perſonal exiſtence when the Covenant was made.

43. They therefore that look upon Juſtification or Righteouſneſs, as coming to us immediately by Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs to us, without the Inſtrumental Intervention and Conveyance or Collation by this Deed of Gift or Covenant, do confound themſelves by confounding and overlooking the Cauſes of our Juſtification. That which Chriſt did by his merits was to procure the new Covenant. The new Covenant is a free Gift of pardon and life with Chriſt himſelf, for his merits and ſatisfaction ſake.

44. Though the Perſon of the Mediator be not really or reputatively the very *perſon of each ſinner*, (nor ſo *many perſons* as there are *ſinners* or *believers*,) yet it doth belong to the *Perſon of the Mediator*, ſo far (limitedly) to *bear the perſon of a ſinner*, and to ſtand in the place of the *Perſons of all Sinners*, as to bear the puniſhment they deſerved, and to ſuffer for their ſins.

45. Scripture ſpeaking of moral matters, uſually ſpeaketh rather in Moral than meer Phyſical phraſe:

phraſe: And in ſtrict Phyſical ſence, Chriſts very perſonal Righteouſneſs (Material or Formal) is not ſo given to us, as that we are proprietors of the very thing it ſelf, but only of the effects (Pardon, Righteouſneſs and Life,) yet in a larger Moral phraſe that very thing is oft ſaid to be given to us, which is given to another, or done or ſuffered for our benefit. He that ranſometh a Captive from a Conquerer, Phyſically giveth the Money to the Conquerer & not to the Captive, & giveth the Captive only the Liberty purchaſed: But *morally* and reputatively he is ſaid to give the Money to the Captive, becauſe he gave it *for him*. And it redeemeth him as well as if he had given it himſelf. He that giveth ten thouſand pounds to purchaſe Lands, & freely giveth that land to another; phyſically giveth the *Money* to the *Seller* only, and the Land only to the other. But morally and reputatively we content our ſelves with the metonymical phraſe, and ſay, he gave the other ten thouſand pound. So morally it may be ſaid, that Chriſts Righteouſneſs, Merits and Satisfaction, was given to us, in that the thing purchaſed by it was given to us; when the Satisfaction was given or made to God. Yea when we ſaid it was made to God, we mean only that he was paſſively the *Terminus* of active Satisfaction, being the party ſatisfyed; but not that he himſelf was made the Subject and Agent of Habits and Acts, and Righteouſneſs of Chriſt as in his humane nature, except as the Divine Nature acted it, or by Communication of Attributes.

46. Becauſe the words [*Perſon*] and [*Perſonating*] and [*Repreſenting*] are ambiguous (as all humane language is,) while ſome uſe them in a *ſtricter*

ſenſe than others do, we muſt try by other explicatory terms whether we agree in the matter, and not lay the ſtreſs of our Controverſy upon the bare words. So ſome Divines ſay that Chriſt ſuffered in the *Perſon of a ſinner*, when they mean not that he repreſented the Natural perſon of any one particular ſinner; but that his own *Perſon* was reputed the Sponſor of ſinners by God, and that he was judged a real ſinner by his perſecuters; and ſo ſuffered as if he had been a ſinner.

47. As Chriſt is leſs improperly ſaid to have Repreſented our Perſons in his ſatisfactory Sufferings, than in his perſonal perfect *Holineſs* and *Obedience*; ſo he is leſs improperly ſaid to have *Repreſented all mankind as newly fallen in Adam, in a General ſenſe, for the purchaſing of the univerſal Gift of Pardon and Life, called, The new Covenant; than to have Repreſented in his perfect Holineſs and his Sufferings, every Believer conſidered as from his firſt being to his Death.* Though it is certain that he dyed for all their ſins from firſt to laſt. For it is moſt true, 1. That Chriſt is as a ſecond *Adam*, the Root of the Redeemed; And as we derive ſin from *Adam*, ſo we derive life from Chriſt, (allowing the difference between a Natural and a Voluntary way of derivation.) And though no mans *Perſon* as a *Perſon* was actually *exiſtent* and *offended* in *Adam*, (nor was by God reputed to have been and done) yet all mens Perſons were *Virtually* and *Seminally* in *Adam* as is aforeſaid; and when they *are exiſtent perſons*, they are no better either by *Relative Innocency*, or by *Phyſical Diſpoſition*, than he could propagate: and are truly and juſtly reputed by God to be *Perſons Guilty of Adams fact*, ſo far as they were by nature ſemi-

ſeminally and virtually in him: And Chriſt the ſecond *Adam* is in a ſort the root of *Man as Man*, (though not by propagation of us, yet) as he is the *Redeemer* of *Nature* it ſelf from deſtruction, but more notably the *Root* of *Saints as Saints*, who are to have no real ſanctity but what ſhall be derived from him by Regeneration, as Nature and Sin is from *Adam* by Generation. But *Adam* did not repreſent all his poſterity as to all the Actions which they ſhould do themſelves from their Birth to their Death; ſo that they ſhould all have been taken for perfectly obedient to the death, if *Adam* had not ſinned at that time, yea or during his Life. For if any of them under that Covenant had ever ſinned afterward in their own perſon, they ſhould have died for it. But for the time paſt, they were Guiltleſs or Guilty in *Adam*, as he was Guiltleſs or Guilty himſelf, ſo far as they were in *Adam*: And though that was but in *Cauſâ*, *& non extra cauſam*; Yet a Generating Cauſe which propagateth eſſence from eſſence, by ſelf-multiplication of form, much differeth from an *Arbitrary facient Cauſe* in this. If *Adam* had obeyed, yet all his poſterity had been nevertheleſs bound to perfect perſonal perſevering Obedience on pain of Death. And Chriſt the ſecond *Adam* ſo far bore the perſon of fallen *Adam*, and ſuffered in the nature and room of Mankind in General, as without any condition on their part at all; to give man by an act of Oblivion or new Covenant a pardon of *Adams* ſin, yea and of all ſin paſt, at the time of their conſent, though not diſobliging them from all future Obedience. And by his perfect Holineſs and Obedience and Sufferings, he hath merited that new Covenant, which *Acceepteth* of

ſincere, though imperfect, Obedience, and maketh no more in us neceſſary to Salvation. When I ſay he did this *without* any *Condition* on mans part, I mean, He *abſolutely without Condition, merited and gave us the Juſtifying Teſtament* or *Covenant*. Though that Covenant give us not Juſtification abſolutely, but on Condition of *believing, fiducial Conſent*. 2. And ſo as this *Univerſal Gift* of Juſtification upon Acceptance, is actually given to all fallen mankind as ſuch; ſo Chriſt might be ſaid to ſuffer inſtead of all, yea and merit too, ſo far as to procure them this Covenant-gift.

48. The ſum of all lyeth in applying the diſtinction of giving Chriſts Righteouſneſs *as ſuch in it ſelf*, and as *a cauſe of our Righteouſneſs*, or in the *Cauſality of it*. As our ſin is not reputed Chriſts ſin *in it ſelf*, and in the culpability of it (for then it muſt needs make Chriſt odious to God) but in its *Cauſality of puniſhment*: ſo Chriſt's Material or Formal Righteouſneſs, is not by God reputed to be properly and abſolutely *our own* in *it ſelf* as *ſuch*, but the *Cauſality* of it as it produceth ſuch and ſuch effects.

49. The Objections which are made againſt Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs in the ſound ſenſe, may all be anſwered as they are by our Divines; among whom the chiefeſt on this ſubject are *Davenant de Juſtit. Habit & Actual. Johan. Crocius de Juſtif. Nigrinus de Impletione Legis*, Bp. *G. Downam of Juſtif. Chamier, Paræus, Ameſius and Junius* againſt *Bellarm.* But the ſame reaſons againſt the unſound ſence of Imputation are unanſwerable. Therefore if any ſhall ſay concerning my following Arguments, that moſt of them are uſed, by *Gregor.*

de

de Valent. by *Bellarm. Becanus*, or other Papists, or by Socinians, and are answered by *Nigrinus, Crocius, Davenant*, &c. Such words may serve to deceive the simple that are led by Names and Prejudice; but to the Intelligent they are contemptible, unless they prove that these objections are made by the Papists against the same sence of Imputation against which I use them, and that it is that sense which all those Protestants defend in answering them: For who-ever so answereth them, will appear to answer them in vain.

50. How far those Divines who do use the phrase of *Christs suffering in our person*, do yet limit the sense in their exposition, and deny that we are reputed to have fulfilled the Law in Christ: because it is tedious to cite many, I shall take up now with one, even Mr. *Lawson* in his *Theopolitica*, which (though about the office of Faith he some-what differ from me) I must needs call an excellent Treatise, as I take the Author to be one of the most Knowing men yet living that I know.) Pardon me if I be large in transcribing his words.

"Pag. 100, 101. [If we enquire of the manner "how Righteousness and Life is derived from Christ, "being one unto so many, it cannot be, except "Christ be a general Head of mankind, and one "Person with them, as *Adam* was. We do not read of "any but two who were general Heads, and in some "respect virtually, *All mankind*; the "*first* and *second Adam*. —— The Mark, *Virtually*. "principal cause of this Representation "whereby he is one person with us, is "the will of God, who as Lord made him such, "and as Lawgiver and Judge did so account him.

" But, 2. How far is he *One person with us*? Anſ.
" 1. In general ſo far as it pleaſed God
Not abſolutely. " to make him ſo, and no further. 2. In
" particular, He and we are one ſo far
" 1. As to make him liable to the pe-
" nalty of the Law for us. 2. So far as to free us
" from that obligation, and derive the benefit of his
" death to us. Though Chriſt be ſo far one with us
" as to be lyable unto the penalty of the Law, and
" to ſuffer it, and upon this ſuffering we are freed;
" yet Chriſt is not the ſinner, nor the ſinner Chriſt.
" Chriſt is the Word made fleſh, innocent without
" ſin, an univerſal Prieſt and King: but we are none
" of theſe. Though we be accounted
Mark by a Trope. " as one perſon in Law with him, by a
" Trope; yet in proper ſence it cannot
" be ſaid *that in Chriſt's Satisfying we*
" *ſatisfied for our own ſins.* For then we ſhould have
" been the Word made fleſh, able to plead Innocen-
" cy, &c. All which are falſe, impoſ-
Mark how far. " ſible, blaſphemous if affirmed by any.
" It's true, we are ſo one with him, that
" he ſatisfied for us, and the benefit of
" this Satisfaction redounds to us, and is communi-
" cable to all, upon certain termes; though not
" actually communicated to all: From this Unity
" and Identity of perſon in Law (if I may ſo
" ſpeak) it followeth clearly that Chriſt's ſuffer-
" ings were not only Afflictions, but Puniſhments
" in proper ſenſe. ——*Pag.* 102, 103. That Chriſt
" died for all in ſome ſence muſt needs be granted,
" becauſe the Scripture expreſſly affirms it (*vid.*
" *reliqua.*) —

" There is another queſtion unprofitably hand-
" led,

"led, Whether the *Propitiation* which includeth "both Satisfaction and Merit, be to be aſcribed to the "Active or Paſſive Obedience of Chriſt? *Anſ.* 1. "Both his Active, Perſonal, Perfect and Perpetual "Obedience, which by reaſon of his humane nature "aſſumed, and ſubjection unto God was due, and al- "ſo that Obedience to the great and tranſcendent "Command of ſuffering the death of the Croſs, "both concur as Cauſes of Remiſſion and Juſtificati- "on. 2. The Scriptures uſually aſcribe it to the Blood, "Death, & Sacrifice of Chriſt, and never to the Perſo- "nal Active Obedience of Chriſt's to the Moral Law. "3. Yet this Active Obedience is neceſſary, becauſe "without it he could not have offered that great "Sacrifice of himſelf without ſpot to God. And if "it had not been without ſpot, it could not have "been propitiatory and effectual for Expiation. 4. If "Chriſt as our Surety had performed for us perfect "and perpetual Obedience, ſo that we might have "been judged to have perfectly and fully kept "the Law by him, then no ſin could have been "chargeable upon us, and the Death of Chriſt had "been needleſs and ſuperfluous. 5. Chriſts Propi- "tiation freeth the Believer not only from the obli- "gation unto puniſhment of ſenſe, but of loſs; "and procured for him not only deliverance from "evil deſerved, but the enjoyment of all good ne- "ceſſary to our full happineſs. Therefore, there is "no ground of Scripture for that opinion, that the "Death of Chriſt and his Sufferings free us from pu- "niſhments, and by his Active Obedience imputed "to us we are made righteous, and the heirs of life. "6. If Chriſt was bound to perform perfect and "perpetual Obedience for us, and he alſo performed

"it

" it for us, then we are freed not only from sin, but " Obedience too: And this Obedience as distinct and " separate from Obedience unto death, may be plea- " ded for Justification of Life, and will be sufficient " to carry the Cause. For the tenor of the Law " was this, *Do this and live:* And if man do this " by himself or Surety, so as that the Lawgiver and " supreme Judg accept it, the Law can require no " more. It could not bind to perfect Obedience and " to punishment too. There was never any such " Law made by God or just men. Before I conclude " this particular of the extent of Christs Merit and " Propitiation, I thought good to inform the Rea- " der, that as the Propitiation of Christ maketh no " man absolutely, but upon certain terms pardon- " able and savable; so it was never made, either " to prevent all sin, or all punishments: For it pre- " supposeth man both sinful and miserable: And " we know that the Guilt and Punishment of " *Adams* sin, lyeth heavy on all his posterity to this " day. And not only that, but the guilt of actual " and personal sins lyeth wholly upon us, whilest " impenitent and unbelieving and so out of Christ. " And the Regenerate themselves are not fully freed " from all punishments till the final Resurrection " and Judgment. So that his Propitiation doth not " altogether prevent but remove sin and punish- " ment by degrees. Many sins may be said to be " Remissible by vertue of this Sacrifice, which ne- " ver shall be remitted.] So far Mr. *Lawson.*

Here I would add only these Animadversions. 1. That whereas he explaineth *Christs personating us* in suffering by the similitude of a Debtor and his Surety who are the same person in Law: I note 1. That

That the case of Debt much differeth from the case of Punishment. 2. That a Surety of Debt is either antecedently such, or consequently: Antecedently, either first one that is bound equally with the Debtor, 2. or one that promiseth to pay if he do not. I think the Law accounteth neither of these to be the *Person* of the principal Debtor (as it doth a Servant by whom he sends the Debt.) But Christ was neither of these: For the Law did not beforehand oblige him with us, nor did he in Law-sence undertake to pay the Debt, if we failed. Though God decreed that he should do so; yet that was no part of the sence of the Law. But consequently, if a friend of the Debtor when he is in Jayl will, without his request or knowledg, say to the Creditor, I will pay you all the Debt; but so that he shall be in my power, and not have present liberty (lest he abuse it) but on the terms that I shall please; yea not at all if he ungratefully reject it] This *Consequens* Satisfyer, or Sponsor, or Paymaster, is not in Law-sence the same *Person* with the Debtor: But if any will call him so, I will not contend about a word, while we agree of the thing (the terms of deliverance.) And this is as near the Case between Christ and us, as the similitude of a Debtor will allow.

2. I do differ from Mr. *Lawson* and *Pareus*, and *Ursine*, and *Olevian*, and *Scultetus* and all that sort of worthy Divines in this, that whereas they make Christs Holiness and perfect Obedience to be but *Justitia personæ*, necessary to make his Sacrifice spotless and so effectual: I think that *of it self* it is as directly the cause of our Pardon, Justification and Life, as Christs Passion is; The Passion being satisfactory

factory and ſo meritorious, and the perſonal Holineſs Meritorious and ſo Satisfactory. For the truth is, The Law that condemned us was not fulfilled by Chriſts ſuffering for us, but the *Lawgiver* ſatisfied inſtead of the fulfilling of it: And that Satisfaction lyeth, in the ſubſtitution of that which as fully (or more) attaineth the ends of the Law as our own ſuffering would have done. Now the ends of the Law may be attained by immediate Merit of Perfection as well as by Suffering; but beſt by both. For 1. By the perfect Holineſs and Obedience of Chriſt, the Holy and perfect will of God is *pleaſed*: whence [*This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleaſed.*] 2. In order to the ends of Government, Holineſs and perfect Obedience, is honoured and freed from the contempt which ſin would caſt upon it; and the holineſs *of the Law* in its *Precepts* is publickly honoured in this grand Exemplar; In whom only the will of God was done on Earth, as it is done in Heaven. And ſuch a Specimen to the World is greatly conducible to the ends of Government: So that Chriſt voluntarily taking humane nature, which as ſuch is obliged to this Perfection, He firſt highly merited of God the Father hereby, and this with his Suffering, went to attain the ends that our ſuffering ſhould have attained, much better. So that at leaſt as *Meritorious*, if not ſecondarily as *ſatisfactory*, I ſee not but *Chriſts Holineſs* procureth the *Juſtifying Covenant* for us, equally with his Death. A Prince may pardon a Traitor for *ſome noble ſervice of his Friend*, as well as for his ſuffering: much more for both. This way go *Grotius de ſatisf.* Mr. *Bradſhaw* and others.

3. When Mr. *Lawſon* ſaith that the Law binds not

not to Obedience and Puniſhment both, he meaneth as to the ſame Act: which contradicts not what *Nigrinus* and others ſay, that it binds a ſinner to puniſhment for ſin paſt, and yet to Obedience for the time to come: (which cannot be entire and perfect.)

So pag. 311. *Cap.* 22. *Qu.* 2. Whether there be two parts of Juſtification, Remiſſion and Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs. 1. He referreth us to what is aforecited againſt Imputation of Chriſts Active Righteouſneſs, ſeparated or abſtracted for Reward from the Paſſive. 2. He ſheweth that *Paul* taketh *Remiſſion of ſin and Imputation of Righteouſneſs for the ſame thing.*] So ſay many of ours.

In concluſion I will mind the Reader, that by reading ſome Authors for Imputation, I am brought to doubt whether ſome deny not all true Remiſſion of ſin, that is, Remiſſion of the deſerved puniſhment. Becauſe I find that by *Remiſſion* they mean *A non-Imputation of ſin under the formal notion of ſin*; that God taketh it not to be our ſin, but Chriſts; and Chriſts Righteouſneſs and perfection to be ſo ours, as that God accounteth us not as truly ſinners. And ſo they think that the *Reatus Culpæ* as well as *Pœnæ* ſimply in it ſelf is done away. Which if it be ſo, then the *Reatus Pœnæ*, the obligation to puniſhment, or the *dueneſs* of puniſhment, cannot be ſaid to be diſſolved or remitted, becauſe it was never contracted. Where I hold, that it is the *Reatus ad Pœnam* the *Dueneſs* of puniſhment only that is remitted, and the *guilt* of *ſin* not as in it ſelf, but in its *Cauſality* of puniſhment. And ſo in all common language, we ſay we forgive a man his fault, when we forgive him all the penalty poſitive and privative. Not eſteeming him, 1. Never to have done the fact. 2. Or that

fact

fact not to have been a fault, *and his fault*, 3. but that punishment for that fault, is forgiven him, and the fault so far as it is a cause of punishment. We must not feign God to judg fallly.

This maketh me think of a saying of Bp. *Usher* to me, when I mentioned the Papists placing Justification and Remission of sin conjunct, he told me that the Papists ordinarily acknowledg no Remission. And on search I find that *Aquinas* and the most of them place no true Remission of sin, in Justification: For by *Remission* (which they make part of Justification,) they mean *Mortification, or destroying sin it self* in the act or habit. But that the *pardon* of the punishment is a thing that we all need, is not denyable; nor do they deny it, though they deny it to be part of our Justification. For it's strange if they deny Christ the pardoning power which they give the Pope. And as *Joh. Crocius de Justif.* oft tells them, They should for shame grant that Christs Righteousness may be as far imputed to us, as they say a Saints or Martyrs redundant merits and supererogations are.

But if the *Guilt* of *Fact and Guilt of Fault* in it self considered, be not both imputed first to us, that is, If we be not judged sinners, I cannot see how we can be judged *Pardoned sinners*; For he that is judged to have no sin, is judged to deserve no punishment. Unless they will say that to prevent the *form and desert* of *sin*, is *eminenter*, though not *formaliter*, to forgive. But it is another (even Actual) forgiveness which we hear of in the Gospel, and pray for daily in the Lords prayer. Of all which see the full Scripture-proof in Mr. *Hotchkis* of *Forgiveness of sin*.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

A further explication of the Controverſie.

Yet I am afraid leſt I have not made the ſtate of the Controverſie plain enough to the unexerciſed Reader, and leſt the very explicatory diſtinctions and propoſitions, though needful and ſuitable to the matter, ſhould be unſuitable to his capacity; I will therefore go over it again in a ſhorter way, and make it as plain as poſſibly I can; being fully perſwaded, that it is not ſo much Argumentation, as help to understand *the* matter, *and our* own *and* other mens ambiguous *words, that is needful to end our abominable Contentions.*

§ 1. THE Righteouſneſs of a Perſon is formally a moral Relation of that Perſon.

§ 2. This moral Relation, is the Relation of that perſon to the *Rule* by which he is to be judged.

§ 3. And it is his Relation to ſome *Cauſe*, or ſuppoſed Accuſation or Queſtion to be decided by that judgment.

§ 4. The Rule of Righteouſneſs here is Gods Law, naturally or ſupernaturally made known.

§ 5. The

fact not to have been a fault, *and his fault*, 3. but that punishment for that fault, is forgiven him, and the fault so far as it is a cause of punishment. We must not feign God to judg falsly.

This maketh me think of a saying of Bp. *Ushers* to me, when I mentioned the Papists placing Justification and Remission of sin conjunct, he told me that the Papists ordinarily acknowledg no Remission. And on search I find that *Aquinas* and the most of them place no true Remission of sin, in Justification: For by *Remission* (which they make part of Justification,) they mean *Mortification, or destroying sin it self* in the act or habit. But that the *pardon* of the punishment is a thing that we all need, is not denyable; nor do they deny it, though they deny it to be part of our Justification. For it's strange if they deny Christ the pardoning power which they give the Pope. And as *Joh. Crocius de Justif.* oft tells them, They should for shame grant that Christs Righteousness may be as far imputed to us, as they say a Saints or Martyrs redundant merits and supererogations are.

But if the *Guilt* of *Fact and Guilt of Fault* in it self considered, be not both imputed first to us, that is, If we be not judged sinners, I cannot see how we can be judged *Pardoned sinners*; For he that is judged to have no sin, is judged to deserve no punishment. Unless they will say that to prevent the *form and desert* of *sin*, is *eminenter*, though not *formaliter*, to forgive. But it is another (even Actual) forgiveness which we hear of in the Gospel, and pray for daily in the Lords prayer. Of all which see the full Scripture-proof in Mr. *Hotchkis* of *Forgiveness of sin*.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

A further explication of the Controverſie.

Yet I am afraid leſt I have not made the ſtate of the Controverſie plain enough to the unexerciſed Reader, and leſt the very explicatory diſtinctions and propoſitions, though needful and ſuitable to the matter, ſhould be unſuitable to his capacity; I will therefore go over it again in a ſhorter way, and make it as plain as poſſibly I can; being fully perſwaded, that it is not ſo much Argumentation, as help to underſtand *the* matter, *and our* own *and* other mens ambiguous *words, that is needful to end our abominable Contentions.*

§ 1. THE Righteouſneſs of a Perſon is formally a moral Relation of that Perſon.

§ 2. This moral Relation, is the Relation of that perſon to the *Rule* by which he is to be judged.

§ 3. And it is his Relation to ſome *Cauſe*, or ſuppoſed Accuſation or Queſtion to be decided by that judgment.

§ 4. The Rule of Righteouſneſs here is Gods Law, naturally or ſupernaturally made known.

§ 5. The

§ 5. The Law hath a Preceptive part, determining what ſhall be due from us, and a Retributive part determining what ſhall be due to us.

§ 6. The Precept inſtituting Duty, our Actions and Diſpoſitions, which are the Matter of that duty, are phyſically conſidered, conform or diſconform to the Precept.

§ 7. Being Phyſically, they are conſequently ſo Morally conſidered, we being Moral Agents, and the Law a Rule of Morality.

§ 8. If the *Actions* be righteous or unrighteous, conſequently the Perſon is ſo, in reference to thoſe Actions, ſuppoſing that to be his *Cauſe*, or the *Queſtion* to be decided.

§ 9. Unrighteouſneſs as to this Cauſe, is *Guilt*, or *Reatus Culpæ*; and to be unrighteous is to be *Sons*, or Guilty of ſin.

§ 10. The *Retributive* part of the Law is, 1. Premiant, for Obedience; 2. Penal, for Diſobedience.

§ 11. To be Guilty or Unrighteous as to the reward, is, to have no right to the reward (that being ſuppoſed the Queſtion in judgment): And to be Righteous here, is to have *right* to the *reward*.

§ 12. To be *Guilty* as to the penalty, is to be *jure puniendus*, or *Reus pœnæ*, or *obligatus ad pœnam*. And to be righteous here, is to have *Right* to *impunity*, (*quoad pœnam damni & ſenſus*.)

§ 13. The firſt Law made *perſonal*, *perfect*, *perſevering Innocency* both mans duty, and the Condition of the Reward and Impunity, and any ſin the condition of puniſhment.

§ 14. Man broke this Law, and ſo loſt his Innocency, and ſo the Condition became naturally impoſſible to him, *de futuro*.

§ 15. There-

§ 15. Therefore that Law as a Covenant, that is, the Promiſſory part with its Condition, ceaſed; *ceſſante capacitate ſubditi*; and ſo did the preceptive part. 1. As it commanded abſolute Innocency (of act and habit.) 2. And as it commanded the ſeeking of the Reward on the Condition and by the means of perſonal Innocency. The Condition thus paſſing into the nature of a ſentence; And puniſhment remaining due for the ſin.

§ 16. But the Law remained ſtill an obliging Precept for future perfect Obedience, and made puniſhment due for all future ſin: and theſe two parts of it, as the Law of lapſed Nature, remained in force, between the firſt ſin, and the new-Covenant promiſe or Law of Grace.

§ 17. The eternal Word interpoſing, a Mediator is promiſed, and Mercy maketh a Law of Grace, and the Word becometh mans Redeemer by undertaking, and by preſent actual reprieve, pardon and initial deliverance: and the fallen world, the miſerable ſinners, with the Law and obligations which they were under, are now become the Redemers *jure Redemptionis*, as before they were the Creator's *jure Creationis*.

§ 18. The Redeemers Law then hath two parts; 1. The ſaid Law of lapſed nature (binding to future perfect obedience or puniſhment) which he found man under (called vulgarly the Moral Law.) 2. And a pardoning Remedying Law of Grace.

§ 19. Becauſe man had diſhonoured God and his Law by ſin, the Redeemer undertook to take mans nature without ſin, and by perfect Holineſs and Obedience. and by becoming a Sacrifice for ſin, to bring that Honour to God and his Law which

we ſhould have done, and to attain the Ends of Law and Government inſtead of our *Perfection* or *Puniſhment*, that for the Merit hereof we might be delivered and live.

§ 20. This he did in the third perſon of a Mediator, who as ſuch had a Law or Covenant proper to himſelf, the Conditions of which he performed, (by perfect keeping, 1. The Law of Innocency; 2. Of *Moſes*; 3. And that proper to himſelf alone) and ſo merited all that was promiſed to him, for Himſelf and Us.

§ 21. By his Law of Grace (as our Lord-Redeemer) he gave firſt to all mankind (in *Adam*, and after in *Noah*, and by a ſecond fuller edition at his Incarnation) a free Pardon of the deſtructive puniſhment (but not of all puniſhment) with right to his Spirit of Grace, Adoption and Glory, in Union with Himſelf their Head, on Condition initially of Faith and Repentance, and progreſſively of ſincere Obedience to the end, to be performed by his Help or Grace.

§ 22. By this Law of Grace (ſuppoſing the Law of lapſed nature aforeſaid, incluſively) all the World is ruled, and ſhall be judged, according to that edition of it (to *Adam* or by Chriſt) which they are under. And by it they ſhall be Juſtified or Condemned.

§ 23. If the queſtion then be, Have you kept or not kept the Conditions of the Law of Grace, Perſonal Performance or nothing muſt ſo far be our Righteouſneſs, and not Chriſts keeping them for us, or Satisfaction for our not keeping them. And this is the great Caſe (ſo oft by Chriſt deſcribed *Mat.* 7. & 25. *&c.*) to be decided in judgment; and therefore the word *Righteous* and *Righteouſneſs* are uſed for what

what is thus personal hundreds of times in Scripture.

§ 24. But as to the question, *Have we kept* the *Law of Innocency*? we must confess guilt and say, No: neither Immediately by our selves, nor Mediately by another, or Instrument: for *Personal Obedience* only is the performance required by that Law; Therefore we have no *Righteousness* consisting in such Performance or Innocency; but must confess sin, and plead a pardon.

§ 25. Therefore no man hath a proper *Universal Righteousness*, excluding all kind of Guilt whatsoever.

§ 26. Therefore no man is justified by the Law of Innocency (nor the Law Mosaical as of works;) either by the Preceptive or Retributive part: for we broke the Precept, and are by the Threatning heirs of death.

§ 27. That Law doth not justifie us, because Christ fulfilled it for us: For it said not (in words or sense) [Thou or one for thee shall *Perfectly Obey*, or *Suffer*:] It mentioned no Substitute: But it is the Law-giver (and not that Law) that justifieth us by other means.

§ 28. But we have *another Righteousness imputed* to us *instead of that Perfect Legal Innocency* and *Rewardableness*, by which we shall be *accepted of God*, and *glorified* at last as surely and fully (at least) as if we had never sinned, or had perfectly kept that Law; which therefore may be called our *Pro-legal Righteousness*.

§ 29. But this Righteousness is not yet either OURS by such a propriety as a Personal performance would have bin, nor OURS to all the same

ends and purposes: It saveth us not from all pain, death or penal desertion, nor constituteth our Relation just the same.

§ 30. It is the Law of Grace that Justifieth us, both as giving us Righteousness, and as *Virtually judging* us Righteous when it hath made us so, and it is Christ as Judg according to that Law (and God by Christ) that will *sentence* us just, and *executively* so use us.

§ 31. The Grace of Christ first giveth us *Faith* and *Repentance* by effectual Vocation: And then the Law of Grace by its *Donative* part or Act doth give us a *Right* to *Union* with Christ as the Churches Head (and so to his Body) and with him a right to Pardon of past sin, and to the Spirit to dwell and act in us for the future, and to the Love of God, and Life eternal, to be ours in possession, if we sincerely obey and persevere.

§ 32. The total Righteousness then which we have (as an Accident of which we are the Subjects,) is 1. A right to Impunity, by the free Pardon of all our sins, and a right to Gods Favour and Glory, as a free gift *quoad valorem*, but as a *Reward* of our Obedience, *quoad Ordinem conferendi & rationem Comparativam* (why one rather than another is judged meet for that free gift.) 2. And the *Relation* of one that hath by grace performed the Condition of that free Gift, without which we had been no capable recipients: which is initially [Faith and Repentance] the Condition of our Right begun, and consequently, sincere Obedience and Perseverance (the Condition of continued right.)

§ 33. Christs personal Righteousness is no one of these, and so is not our *Constitutive Righteousness* for-

formally and ſtrictly ſo called: For *Formally* our Righteouſneſs is a *Relation*, (of right;) and it is the Relation of our own Perſons: And a Relation is an accident: And the numerical Relation (or Right) of one perſon cannot be the ſame numerical Accident of another perſon as the ſubject.

§ 34. There are but three ſorts of *Cauſes*; *Efficient*, *Conſtitutive*, and *Final*.

1. Chriſt is the efficient cauſe of all our Righteouſneſs: (1. Of our Right to Pardon and Life; 2. And of our Goſpel-Obedience:) And that many waies: 1. He is the Meritorious Cauſe: 2. He is the *Donor* by his Covenant; 3. And the Donor or Operator of our Inherent Righteouſneſs by his Spirit: 4. And the moral efficient by his Word, Promiſe, Example, &c.

2. And Chriſt is partly the final cauſe.

3. But all the doubt is whether his perſonal Righteouſneſs be the *Conſtitutive Cauſe*.

§ 35. The *Conſtitutive Cauſe* of natural bodily ſubſtances conſiſteth of *Matter diſpoſed*, and *Form*. Relations have no *Matter*, but inſtead of *Matter* a *Subject* (and that is *Our own perſons* here, and not Chriſt.) and a *terminus* and *fundamentum*.

§ 36. The *Fundamentum* may be called both the *Efficient Cauſe* of the *Relation* (as commonly it is) and the *Matter* from which it *reſulteth*: And ſo Chriſts Righteouſneſs is undoubtedly the *Meritorious* efficient Cauſe, and undoubtedly not the *Formal* Cauſe of our perſonal Relation of Righteouſneſs: Therefore all the doubt is of the Material Cauſe.

§ 37. So that all the Controverſie is come up to a bare *name* and Logical term; of which Logicians agree not as to the aptitude. All confeſs that Rela-

lations have no proper *Matter*, beſides the ſubject: all confeſs that the *Fundamentum* is *loco efficientis*, but whether it be a fit name to call it the *Conſtitutive Matter* of a Relation, there is no agreement.

§ 38. And if there were, it would not decide this Verbal Controverſie: For 1. *Titulus eſt fundamentum Juris*: The *fundamentum* of our *Right to Impunity and Life* in and with Chriſt, is the *Donative act* of our Saviour in and by his Law or Covenant of Grace: that is our *Title*; And from that our Relation reſulteth, the *Conditio tituli vel juris* being found in our ſelves. 2. And our Relation of *Performers* of that Condition of the Law of Grace, reſulteth from our own performance as the *fundamentum* (compared to the Rule.) So that both theſe parts of our Righteouſneſs have a nearer *fundamentum* than Chriſts perſonal Righteouſneſs.

§ 39. But the *Right* given us by the Covenant (and the Spirit and Grace) being a Right merited firſt by Chriſts perſonal Righteouſneſs, this is a *Cauſa Cauſæ, id eſt, fundamenti, ſeu Donationis*: And while this much is certain, whether it ſhall be called a *Remote fundamentum* (*viz. Cauſa fundamenti*) and ſo a Remote Conſtitutive Material Cauſe, or only (properly) a Meritorious Cauſe, may well be left to the arbitrary Logician, that uſeeth ſuch notions as he pleaſes; but verily is a Controverſie unfit to tear the Church for, or deſtroy Love and Concord by.

§ 40. Queſt. 1. *Is Chriſts Righteouſneſs OURS?* *Anſ.* Yes; In ſome ſenſe, and in another not.

§ 41. Queſt. 2. *Is Chriſts Righteouſneſs OURS?* *Anſ.* Yes; In the ſenſe before opened; For *all things are ours*; and his righteouſneſs more than lower Cauſes.

§ 2. Queſt.

§ 42. Queſt. 3. *Is Chriſts Righteouſneſs OURS as it was or is His own, with the ſame ſort of propriety?* *Anſ.* No.

§ 43. Queſt. 4. *Is the formal Relation of Righteous an accident of our perſons, numerically the ſame Righteouſneſs?* Anſ. No; It is impoſſible: Unleſs we are the ſame perſon.

§ 44. Queſt. 5. *Is Chriſt and each Believer one politick perſon? Anſ.* A political perſon is an equivocal word: If you take it for *an Office* (as the King or Judg is a political perſon) I ſay, No: If for a *Society*, Yea; But *noxia & noxa caput ſequuntur*. True *Guilt* is an accident of natural perſons, and of Societies only as conſtituted of ſuch; and ſo is Righteouſneſs; Though Phyſically Good or Evil may for ſociety-ſake, befal us without perſonal deſert or conſent.

But if by [*Perſon*] you mean a certain *State or Condition* (as to be a *ſubject of God*, or one that is to *ſuffer for ſin*) ſo Chriſt may be ſaid to be the ſame *perſon* with us *in ſpecie*, but not *numerically*, becauſe that Accident whence his *Perſonality* is named, is not in the ſame ſubject.

§ 45. Queſt. 6. *Is Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed to us? Anſ.* Yes; If by imputing you mean reckoning or reputing it ours, ſo far as is aforeſaid, that is ſuch a Cauſe of ours.

§ 46. Queſt. 7. *Are we reputed our ſelves to have fulfilled all that Law of Innocency in and by Chriſt, as repreſenting our perſons, as obeying by him?* Anſ. No.

§ 47. Queſt. 8. *Is it Chriſts Divine, Habitual, Active or Paſſive Righteouſneſs which Juſtifieth us? Anſ.* All: viz, the Habitual, Active and Paſſive exalted in Meritorioufneſs by Union with the Divine.

§ 48. Quest. 9. *Is it Christs Righteousness, or our Faith which is said to be imputed to us for Righteousness?* Rom. 4. *Ans.* 1. The text speaketh of imputing Faith, and by Faith is meant Faith, and not *Christs* Righteousness in the word: But that Faith is *Faith in Christ* and his Righteousness; and the Object is *quasi materia actus*, and covenanted.

2. *De re*, both are Imputed: that is, 1. Christs Righteousness is reputed the meritorious Cause. 2. The *free-gift* (by the Covenant) is reputed the *fundamentum juris* (both opposed to our Legal Merit.) 3. And our Faith is *reputed* the *Conditio tituli*, and all that is required in us to our Justification, as making us *Qualified Recipients* of the *free-Gift* merited by Christ.

§ 49. Quest. 10. *Are we any way Justified by our own performed Righteousness?* *Ans.* Yes; Against the charge of non-performance, (as Infidels, Impenitent, Unholy,) and so as being uncapable of the free-gift of Pardon and Life in Christ.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The Reasons of our denying the fore-described rigid sence of Imputation.

Though it were most accurate to reduce what we deny to several Propositions, and to confute each one argumentatively by it self, yet I shall now choose to avoid such prolixity; and for brevity and the satisfaction of such as look more at the force of a Reason, than the form of the Argument, I shall thrust together our denyed Sence, with the manifold Reasons of our denyal.

"WE deny, that God doth so Impute Christs "Righteousness to us, as to repute or ac- "count us to have been Holy with all that Habitu- "al Holiness which was in Christ, or to have done "all that he did in obedience to his Father, or in "fulfilling the Law, or to have suffered all that he "suffered, and to have made God satisfaction for "our own sins, and merited our own Salvation and "Justification, in and by Christ, or that he *was*, "*did* and *suffered*, and *merited*, all this strictly in "the *person* of every sinner that is saved; Or that "Christs very individual Righteousness Material or "Formal, is so made ours in a strict sense, as that "we are Proprietors, Subjects, or Agents of the

" very thing it ſelf ſimply and abſolutely, as it is " diſtinct from the effects ; or that Chriſts Indivi- " dual Formal Righteouſneſs, is made our Formal " Perſonal Righteouſneſs ; or that as to the *effects*, " we have any ſuch Righteouſneſs Imputed to us, " as formally ours, which conſiſteth in a perfect Ha- " bitual and Actual Conformity to the Law of In- " nocency ; that is, that we are reputed perfectly " Holy and ſinleſs, and ſuch as ſhall be Juſtified by " the Law of Innocency, which ſaith, *Perfectly Obey* " and *Live*, or *ſin and die*.] All this we deny.

Let him that will anſwer me, keep to my words, and not alter the ſenſe by leaving any out. And that he may the better underſtand me, I add, 1. I take it for granted that the Law requireth Habitual Holineſs as well as Actual Obedience, and is not fulfilled without both. 2. That Chriſt loved God and man with a perfect conſtant Love, and never ſinned by Omiſſion or Commiſſion. 3. That Chriſt died not only for our Original ſin, or ſin before Converſion, but for all our ſin to our lives end. 4. That he who is ſuppoſed to have no ſin of Omiſſion, is ſuppoſed to have done all his duty. 5. That he that hath done all his duty, is not condemnable by that Law, yea hath right to all the Reward promiſed on Condition of that duty. 6. By Chriſts Material Righteouſneſs, I mean, thoſe Habits, Acts and Sufferings in which his Righteouſneſs did conſiſt, or was founded. 7. By his and our *Formal Righteouſneſs*, I mean the *Relation* it ſelf of being *Righteous*. 8. And I hold that Chriſts Righteouſneſs, did not only *Numerically* (as aforeſaid) but alſo thus *totâ ſpecie*, in kind differ from ours, that his was a *perfect Habitual and Actual Conformity to the Law*

Law of Innocency, together with the peculiar Laws of Mediator-ſhip, by which he merited Redemption for us, and Glory for himſelf and us: But ours is the Pardon of ſin, and Right to Life, Purchaſed, Merited and freely given us by Chriſt in and by a new Covenant, whoſe condition is Faith with Repentance, as to the gift of our Juſtification now, and ſincere Holineſs, Obedience, Victory and Perſeverance as to our poſſeſſion of Glory.

Now our Reaſons againſt the denyed ſence of Imputation are theſe.

1. In general this opinion ſetteth up and introduceth all Antinomianiſm or Libertiniſm, and Ungodlineſs, and ſubverteth the Goſpel and all true Religion and Morality.

I do not mean that all that hold it, have ſuch effects in themſelves, but only that this is the tendency and conſequence of the opinion: For I know that many ſee not the nature and conſequences of their own opinions, and the abundance that hold damnable errors, hold them but notionally in a peeviſh faction, and therefore not dammingly, but hold practically and effectually the contrary ſaving truth. And if the Papiſts ſhall perſwade Men that our doctrine, yea theirs that here miſtake, cannot conſiſt with a godly life, let but the lives of Papiſts and Proteſtants be compared. Yea in one of the Inſtances before given, Though ſome of the Congregational-party hold what was recited, yet ſo far are they from ungodly lives, that the greateſt thing in which I differ from them is, the overmuch unſcriptural ſtrictneſs of ſome of them, in their Church-admiſſions and Communion, while they fly further from ſuch as they think not godly, than I think God would

would have them do, being generally persons fearing God themselves: (Excepting the sinful alienation from others, and easiness to receive and carry false reports of Dissenters, which is common to all that fall into sidings.) But the errors of any men are never the better if they be found in the hands of godly men: For if they be practised they will make them ungodly.

2. It confoundeth the *Person* of the *Mediator*, and of the *Sinner*: As if the Mediator who was proclaimed the Beloved of the Father, and therefore capable of reconciling us to him, because he was still *well-pleased* in him, had (not only suffered in the room of the sinner by voluntary Sponsion, but also) in suffering and doing, been *Civilly* the very person of the sinner himself, that sinner I say, who was an enemy to God, and so esteemed.

3. It maketh Christ to have *been Civilly* as *many persons* as there be elect sinners in the World: which is both beside and contrary to Scripture.

4. It introduceth a false sence and supposition of our sin imputed to Christ, as if Imputatively it were his as it is ours, even the *sinful Habits*, the *sinful Acts*, and the *Relation* of *evil*, *Wicked*, *Ungodly* and *Unrighteous* which resulteth from them: And so it maketh Christ really *hated of God*: For God cannot but *hate* any one whom he reputeth to be truly ungodly, a Hater of God, an Enemy to him, a Rebel, as we all were: whereas it was only the Guilt of Punishment, and not of *Crime*, as such that Christ assumed: He undertook to suffer in the room of sinners; and to be reputed one that had so undertaken; But not to be reputed really a sinner, an ungodly person, hater of God, one that had the Image of the Devil.

5. Nay

5. Nay it maketh Christ to have been incomparably the worst man that ever was in the World by just reputation; and to have been by just imputation guilty of all the sins of all the Elect that ever lived, and reputed one of the Murderers of himself, and *one* of the Persecutors of his Church, or rather *many*: and the language that *Luther* used Catechrestically, to be strictly and properly true.

6. It supposeth a wrong sence of the Imputation of *Adams* sin to his posterity: As if we had been justly reputed *persons existent* in *his person*, and so in him to have been *persons that commited the same sin*; whereas we are only reputed to be *now* (not *then*) *persons* who have a *Nature* derived from him, which being then *seminally only* in him, deriveth by propagation an answerable *Guilt* of his sinful fact, together with *natural Corruption*.

7. It supposeth us to be Justifiable and Justified by the Law of Innocency, made to *Adam*, as it saith [*Obey perfectly and Live.*] As if we fulfilled it by Christ: which is not only an addition to the Scripture, but a Contradiction. For it is only the Law or Covenant of Grace that we are Justified by.

8. It putteth, to that end, a false sence upon the Law of Innocency: For whereas it commandeth *Personal Obedience*, and maketh *Personal* punishment *due* to the offender: This supposeth the Law to say or mean [*Either thou, or one for thee shall Obey*; or, *Thou shalt obey by thy self, or by another*: And *if thou sin thou shalt suffer by thy self, or by another.*

Whereas the Law knew no Substitute or Vicar, no nor Sponsor; nor is any such thing said of it in the Scripture: so bold are men in their additions.

9. It falsly supposeth that we are not Judged and Justi-

would have them do, being generally persons fearing God themselves: (Excepting the sinful alienation from others, and easiness to receive and carry false reports of Dissenters, which is common to all that fall into sidings.) But the errors of any men are never the better if they be found in the hands of godly men: For if they be practised they will make them ungodly.

2. It confoundeth the *Person* of the *Mediator*, and of the *Sinner*: As if the Mediator who was proclaimed the Beloved of the Father, and therefore capable of reconciling us to him, because he was still *well-pleased* in him, had (not only suffered in the room of the sinner by voluntary Sponsion, but also) in suffering and doing, been *Civilly* the very person of the sinner himself; that sinner I say, who was an enemy to God, and so esteemed.

3. It maketh Christ to have *been Civilly* as *many persons* as there be elect sinners in the World: which is both beside and contrary to Scripture.

4. It introduceth a false sence and supposition of our sin imputed to Christ, as if Imputatively it were his as it is ours, even the *sinful Habits*, the *sinful Acts*, and the *Relation* of *evil*, *Wicked*, *Ungodly* and *Unrighteous* which resulteth from them: And so it maketh Christ really *hated of God*: For God cannot but *hate* any one whom he reputeth to be truly ungodly, a Hater of God, an Enemy to him, a Rebel, as we all were: whereas it was only the Guilt of Punishment, and not of *Crime*, as such that Christ assumed: He undertook to suffer in the room of sinners; and to be reputed one that had so undertaken; But not to be reputed really a sinner, an ungodly person, hater of God, one that had the Image of the Devil.

5. Nay

5. Nay it maketh Christ to have been incomparably the worst man that ever was in the World by just reputation; and to have been by just imputation guilty of all the sins of all the Elect that ever lived, and reputed one of the Murderers of himself, and *one* of the Persecutors of his Church, or rather *many*: and the language that *Luther* used Catechrestically, to be strictly and properly true.

6. It supposeth a wrong sence of the Imputation of *Adams* sin to his posterity: As if we had been justly reputed *persons existent* in *his person*, and so in him to have been *persons that committed the same sin*; whereas we are only reputed to be *now* (not *then*) *persons* who have a *Nature* derived from him, which being then *seminally only* in him, deriveth by propagation an answerable *Guilt* of his sinful fact, together with *natural Corruption*.

7. It supposeth us to be Justifiable and Justified by the Law of Innocency, made to *Adam*, as it saith [*Obey perfectly and Live.*] As if we fulfilled it by Christ: which is not only an addition to the Scripture, but a Contradiction. For it is only the Law or Covenant of Grace that we are Justified by.

8. It putteth, to that end, a false sence upon the Law of Innocency: For whereas it commandeth *Personal Obedience*, and maketh *Personal* punishment *due* to the offender: This supposeth the Law to say or mean [*Either thou, or one for thee shall Obey*; or, *Thou shalt obey by thy self, or by another*: And *if thou sin thou shalt suffer by thy self, or by another.*

Whereas the Law knew no Substitute or Vicar, no nor Sponsor; nor is any such thing said of it in the Scripture: so bold are men in their additions.

9. It falsly supposeth that we are not Judged and Justi-

Juſtified by the new Covenant or Law of Grace, but (but is ſaid) by the Law of Innocency.

10. It fathereth on God an erring judgment, as if he reputed, reckoned or accounted things to be what they are not, and us to have done what we did not. To repute Chriſt a Sponſor for ſinners who undertook to obey in their natures, and ſuffer in their place and ſtead, as a Sacrifice to redeem them, is all juſt and true: And to repute *us thoſe* for whom Chriſt did this. But to repute Chriſt to have been really and every one of us, or a ſinner, or guilty of ſin it ſelf; or to repute us to have been habitually as Good as Chriſt was, or actually to have done what he did, either Naturally or Civilly and by Him as our ſubſtitute, and to repute us Righteous by poſſeſſing his formal perſonal Righteouſneſs in it ſelf; All theſe are untrue, and therefore not to be aſcribed to God. To Impute it to us, is but to Repute us as verily and groundedly Righteous by his Merited and freely-Given Pardon, and Right to Life, as if we had merited it our ſelves.

11. It feigneth the ſame Numerical Accident [their *Relation* of *Righteouſneſs*] which was in one ſubject to be in another, which is Impoſſible.

12. It maketh us to have ſatisfied Divine Juſtice for our ſelves, and merited Salvation (and all that we receive) for our ſelves, in and by another: And ſo that we may plead our own Merits with God for Heaven and all his benefits.

13. The very making and tenor of the new Covenant, contradicteth this opinion: For when God maketh a Law or Covenant, to convey the effects of Chriſts Righteouſneſs to us, by degrees and upon certain Conditions, this proveth that the very Righ-

Righteouſneſs in it ſelf ſimply was not ours: elſe we ſhould have had theſe effects of it both preſently and immediately and abſolutely without new Conditions.

14. This opinion therefore maketh this Law of Grace, which giveth the benefits to us by theſe degrees and upon terms, to be an *injury* to Believers, as keeping them from their own.

15. It ſeemeth to deny Chriſts Legiſlation in the Law of Grace, and conſequently his Kingly Office. For if we are reputed to have fulfilled the whole Law of Innocency in Chriſt, there is no buſineſs for the Law of Grace to do.

16. It ſeemeth to make Internal Sanctification by the Spirit needleſs, or at leaſt, as to one half of its uſe: For if we are by juſt Imputation in Gods account perfectly Holy, in Chriſts Holineſs the firſt moment of our believing, nothing can be added to Perfection; we are as fully *Amiable* in the ſight of God, as if we were ſanctified in our ſelves; Becauſe by Imputation it is all our own.

17. And ſo it ſeemeth to make our after-Obedience unneceſſary, at leaſt as to half its uſe: For if in Gods true account, we have perfectly obeyed to the death by another, how can we be required to do it all or part again by our ſelves? If all the debt of our Obedience be paid, why is it required again?

18. And this ſeemeth to Impute to God a nature leſs holy and at enmity to ſin, than indeed he hath; if he can repute a man laden with hateful ſins, to be as perfectly Holy, Obedient and Amiable to him as if he were really ſo in himſelf, becauſe another is ſuch for him.

19. If we did in our own perſons Imputatively what

what Christ did, I think it will follow that we *sinned*; that being unlawful to us which was Good in him. It is a sin for us to be Circumcised, and to keep all the Law of *Moses*, and send forth Apostles, and to make Church-Ordinances needful to Salvation. Therefore we did not this in Christ: And if not this, they that distinguish and tell us what we did in Christ, and what not, must prove it. I know that Christ did somewhat which is a common duty of all men, and somewhat proper to the *Jews*, and somewhat proper to himself: But that one sort of men did one part in Christ, and another sort did another part in him, is to be proved.

20. If Christ suffered but in the Person of sinful man, his sufferings would have been in vain, or no Satisfaction to God: For sinful man is obliged to perpetual punishment; of which a temporal one is but a small part: *Our persons* cannot make a temporal suffering equal to that perpetual one due to man: but the transcendent person of the Mediator did.

Obj. *Christ bore both his own person and ours: It belongeth to him as Mediator to personate the guilty sinner.*

Ans. It belongeth to him as Mediator to undertake the sinners punishment in his own person. And if any will improperly call that, the *Personating and Representing* of the *sinner*, let them limit it, and confess that it is not *simply*, but *in tantum*, so far, and to such uses and no other, and that yet *sinners did it not in* and *by Christ*, but only Christ for them to convey the benefits as he pleased; And then we delight not to quarrel about mere words; though we like the phrase of Scripture better than theirs.

21. If

21. If Chriſt was perfectly Holy and Obedient in our perſons, and we in him, then it was either in the Perſon of Innocent man before we ſinned, or of ſinful man. The firſt cannot be pretended: For man as Innocent had not a Redeemer. If of *ſinful man*, then his perfect Obedience could not be meritorious of our Salvation: For it ſuppoſeth him to do it in the perſon of a ſinner: and he that hath once ſinned, according to that Law, is the Child of death, and uncapable of ever fulfilling a Law, which is fulfilled with nothing but ſinleſs perfect perpetual Obedience.

Obj. *He firſt ſuffered in our ſtead and perſons as ſinners, and then our ſin being pardoned, he after in our perſons fulfilled the Law, inſtead of our after-Obedience to it.*

Anſ. 1. Chriſts Obedience to the Law was before his Death. 2. The ſins which he ſuffered for, were not only before Converſion, but endure as long as our lives: Therefore if he fulfilled the Law in our perſons after we have done ſinning, it is in the perſons only of the dead. 3. We are ſtill obliged to Obedience our ſelves.

Obj. *But yet though there be no ſuch difference in Time, God doth firſt Impute his ſufferings to us for pardon of all our ſins to the death, and in order of nature, his Obedience after it, as the Merit of our Salvation.*

Anſ. 1. God doth Impute or Repute his ſufferings the ſatisfying cauſe of our Pardon, and his Merits of Suffering and the reſt of his Holineſs and Obedience, as the meritorious cauſe of our *Pardon* and our Juſtification and Glory without dividing them. But 2. that implyeth that we did not our ſelves re-

putatively do all this in Christ: As shall be further proved.

22. Their way of Imputation of the Satisfaction of Christ, overthroweth their own doctrine of the Imputation of his Holiness and Righteousness. For if all sin be fully pardoned by the Imputed Satisfaction, then sins of *Omission* and of habitual Privation and Corruption are pardoned; and then the whole punishment both of *Sense* and *Loss* is remitted: And he that hath no sin of Omission or Privation, is a perfect doer of his duty, and holy; and he that hath no punishment of Loss, hath title to Life, according to that Covenant which he is reputed to have perfectly obeyed. And so he is an heir of life, without any Imputed Obedience upon the pardon of all his Disobedience.

Obj. *But* Adam *must have obeyed to the Death if he would have Life eternal: Therefore the bare pardon of his sins did not procure his right to life.*

Ans. True, if you suppose that only his first sin was pardoned: But 1. *Adam* had right to heaven as long as he was sinless. 2. Christ dyed for all *Adams* sins to the last breath, and not for the first only: And so he did for all ours. And if all the sins of omission to the death be pardoned, Life is due to us as righteous.

Obj. *A Stone may be sinless, and yet not righteous nor have Right to life.*

Ans. True: because it is not a capable subject. But a man cannot be sinless, but he is Righteous, and hath right to life by Covenant.

Obj. *But not to punish is one thing and to Reward is another?*

Ans. They are distinct formal Relations and Notions:

tions: But where *felicity is a Gift* and called a *Reward* only for the *terms* and *order* of Collation, and where *Innocency* is the ſame with *perfect Duty*, and is the title-Condition; there to be puniſhed is to be *denyed* the *Gift*, and to be *Rewarded* is to have that *Gift* as qualified perſons: and not to *Reward*, is materially to *puniſh*; and to be reputed innocent is to be reputed a Meriter. And it is impoſſible that the moſt Innocent man can have any thing from God, but by way of free-Gift as to the *Thing* in Values, however it may be merited in point of Governing Paternal Juſtice as to the *Order* of donation.

Obj. *But there is a greater Glory merited by Chriſt, than the Covenant of works promiſed to man.*

Anſ. 1. That's another matter, and belongeth not to Juſtification, but to Adoption. 2. Chriſts Sufferings as well as his Obedience, conſidered as meritorious, did purchaſe that greater Glory. 3. We did not purchaſe or merit it in Chriſt, but Chriſt for us.

23. Their way of Imputation ſeemeth to me to leave no place or poſſibility for Pardon of ſin, or at leaſt of no ſin after Converſion. I mean, that according to their opinion who think that we fulfilled the Law in Chriſt as we are elect from eternity, it leaveth no place for any pardon: And according to their opinion who ſay that we fulfilled it in him as *Believers*, it leaveth no place for pardon of any ſin after Faith. For where the Law is reputed perfectly fulfilled (in Habit & Act) there it is reputed that the perſon hath no ſin. We had no ſin before we had a Being; and if we are reputed to have perfectly obeyed in Chriſt from our firſt Being, we are reputed ſinleſs. But if we are reputed to have obeyed in

him only since our believing, then we are reputed to have no sin since our Believing. Nothing excludeth sin, if perfect Habitual and Actual Holiness and Obedience do not.

24. And consequently Christs blood shed and Satisfaction is made vain, either as to all our lives, or to all after our first believing.

25. And then no believer must confess his sin, nor his desert of punishment nor repent of it, or be humbled for it.

26. And then all prayer for the pardon of such sin is vain, and goeth upon a false supposition, that we have sin to pardon.

27. And then no man is to be a partaker of the Sacrament as a Conveyance or Seal of such pardon; nor to believe the promise for it.

28. Nor is it a duty to *give thanks* to God or Christ for any such pardon.

29. Nor can we expect Justification from such *guilt* here or at *Judgment*.

30. And then those in Heaven praise Christ in errour, when they magnifie him that washed them from such sins in his blood.

31. And it would be no lie to say that we have no sin, at least, since believing.

32. Then no believer should *fear sinning*, because it is *Impossible* and a *Contradiction*, for the same person to be perfectly innocent to the death, and yet a sinner.

33. Then the Consciences of believers have no work to do, or at least, no examining, convincing, self-accusing and self-judging work.

34. This chargeth God by Consequence of wronging all believers whom he layeth the least punishment

niſhment upon: For he that hath perfectly obeyed, or hath perfectly ſatisfied, by himſelf or by another in his perſon, cannot juſtly be puniſhed. But I have elſewhere fully proved, that Death and other Chaſtiſements are puniſhments, though not deſtructive, but corrective: And ſo is the permiſſion of our further ſinning.

35. It intimateth that God wrongeth believers, for not giving them immediately more of the Holy Ghoſt, and not preſent perfecting them and freeing them from all ſin: For though Chriſt may give us the fruits of his own merits in the time and way that pleaſeth himſelf; yet if it be *we our ſelves* that have perfectly ſatisfied and *merited in Chriſt*, we have preſent Right to the thing merited thereupon, and it is an injury to deny it us at all.

36. And accordingly it would be an injury to keep them ſo long out of Heaven, if they themſelves did merit it ſo long ago.

37. And the very *Threatning* of Puniſhment in the Law of Grace would ſeem injurious or incongruous, to them that have already reputatively obeyed perfectly to the death.

38. And there would be no place left for any Reward from God, to any act of obedience done by our ſelves in our natural or real perſon: Becauſe having reputatively fulfilled all Righteouſneſs, and deſerved all that we are capable of by another, our own acts can have no reward.

39. And I think this would overthrow all Humane Laws and Government: For all true Governours are the Officers of God, and do what they do in ſubordination to God; and therefore cannot

juſtly puniſh any man, whom he pronounceth erfectly Innocent to the death.

40. This maketh every believer (at leaſt) as Righteous as Chriſt himſelf, as having true propriety in all the ſame numerical Righteouſneſs as his own. And if we be as Righteous as Chriſt, are we not as amiable to God? And may we not go to God in our Names as Righteous?

41. This maketh all believers (at leaſt) *equally Righteous* in degree, and every one *perfect*, and no difference between them. *David* and *Solomon* as Righteous in the act of ſinning as before, and every weak and ſcandalous believer, to be as Righteous as the beſt. Which is not true, though many ſay that Juſtification hath no degrees, but is perfect at firſt; as I have proved in my *Life of Faith* and elſewhere.

42. This too much levelleth Heaven and Earth; For in Heaven there can be nothing greater than perfection.

43. The Scripture no-where calleth our Imputed Righteouſneſs by the name of Innocency, or ſinleſs Perfection, nor Inculpability Imputed. Nay when the very phraſe of *Imputing Chriſts* Righteouſneſs is not there at all, to add all theſe wrong deſcriptions of Imputation, is ſuch Additions to Gods words as tendeth to let in almoſt any thing that mans wit ſhall excogitate, and ill beſeemeth them, that are for Scripture-ſufficiency and perfection, and againſt Additions in the general. And whether ſome may not ſay that we are Imputatively Chriſt himſelf, Conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, Born of the Virgin Mary, ſuffered under Pontius Pilate, Crucified, &c. I cannot tell.

To conclude, the honeſt plain Chriſtian may without diſquieting the Church or himſelf, be ſatisfied in this certain ſimple truth; That we are ſinners and deſerve everlaſting miſery: That Chriſt hath ſuffered as a Sacrifice for our ſins in our room and ſtead, and ſatisfied the Juſtice of God: That he hath by his perfect Holineſs and Obedience with thoſe ſufferings, merited our pardon and life: That he never hereby intended to make us Lawleſs or have us Holy, but hath brought us under a Law of Grace: which is the Inſtrument by which he pardoneth, juſtifieth and giveth us Right to life: That by this Covenant he requireth of us Repentance and true Faith to our firſt Juſtification, and ſincere Obedience, Holineſs and Perſeverance to our Glorification, to be wrought by his Grace and our Wills excited and enabled by it: That Chriſts Sufferings are to ſave us from ſuffering; but his Holineſs and Obedience are to merit Holineſs, Obedience & Happineſs for us, that we may be like him, and ſo be made perſonally amiable to God: But both his Sufferings and Obedience, do bring us under a Covenant, where Perfection is not neceſſary to our Salvation.

CHAP. V.

The Objections Answered.

" Obj. 1. *YOU confound a Natural and a Politi-*
" *cal person: Christ and the several be-*
" *lieving sinners are not the same natural Person, but*
" *they are the same Political. As are with us,* saith
" Dr. Tullie, *the Sponsor and the Debtor, the Attor-*
" *ney and the Clyent, the Tutor and the Pupil; so are*
" *all the faithful in Christ, both as to their Celestial*
" *regenerate nature, of which he is the first Father, who*
" *begetteth sons by his Spirit and seed of the Word to his*
" *Image, and as to Righteousness derived by Legal*
" *Imputation. Vid.* Dr. Tullie, Justif. Paul. p. 80, 81.
" *It's commonly said that Christ as our surety is our*
" *Person.*

Ans. 1. The distinction of a *Person* into *Natural* and *Political* or *Legal*, is *equivoci in sua equivocata*: He therefore that would not have contention cherished and men taught to damn each other for a word not understood, must give us leave to ask what these equivocals mean. What a *Natural Person* signifieth, we are pretty well agreed; but a *Political Person* is a word not so easily and commonly understood. *Calvin* tells us that *Persona definitur homo qui caput habet civile.* (For *omnis persona est homo, sed non viciſſim: Homo cum est vocabulum naturæ; Persona juris civilis.*) And so (as *Albenius*) *civitas, municipium, Castrum, Collegium, Universitas, & quodlibet corpus, Personæ appellatione continetur, ut Spigel.*

gel. But if this Definition be commenſurate to the common nature of a civil perſon, then a King can be none; nor any one that hath not a *civil head.* This therefore is too narrow. The ſame *Calvin* (*in n. Perſonæ*) tells us, that *Seneca Perſonam vocat, cum præ ſe fert aliquis, quod non eſt*; A Counterfeit: But ſure this is not the ſence of the Objectors. In general ſaith *Calvin, Tam hominem quam qualitatem hominis, ſeu Conditionem ſignificat.* But it is not ſure every *Quality* or *Condition*: *Calvin* therefore giveth us nothing ſatisfactory, to the deciſion of the Controverſie which theſe Divines will needs make, whether each believer and Chriſt be the ſame Political Perſon. *Martinius* will make our Controverſie no eaſier by the various ſignifications gathered out of *Vet. Vocab. Gel. Scaliger, Valla*; Which he thus enumerateth. 1. *Perſona eſt accidens conditio hominis, qualitas quâ homo differt ab homine, tum in animo, tum in corpore, tum in extrinſ.* 2. *Homo qualitate dictâ proditus*: 3. *Homo inſigni qualitate præditus habens gradum eminentiæ, in Eccleſia Dei, &c.* 4. *Figura ſeu facies ficta, larva hiſtrionica, &c.* 5. *Ille qui ſub hujuſmodi figura aliquam repreſentat, &c.* 6. *Figura eminens in ædificiis quæ ore aquam fundit, &c.* *Individua ſubſtantia humana, ſeu ſingularis homo.* 8. *Individua ſubſtantia Intelligens quælibet.* Now which of theſe is *Perſona Politica vel Legalis.* Let us but agree what we mean by the word and I ſuppoſe we ſhall find that we are agreed of the Matter. When I deny the *Perſon* of Chriſt and the ſinner to have been the ſame, or to be ſo reputed by God, I mean by *Perſon*, univocally or properly, An *Individual Intelligent ſubſtance.* And they that mean otherwiſe are obliged to Define; For *Analogum per*

ſe

ſe poſitum ſtat pro ſuo ſignificato famoſiore. If they mean that Chriſt and the Believer are the ſame as to ſome *Quality*, or *Condition*, let them tell us what Quality or Condition it is, and I think we ſhall be found to be of one mind.

But I think by the ſimilitudes of a *Sponſor*, *Attorney*, and *Guardian*, that they mean by a *Political Perſon* (not as a *ſociety*, nor ſuch as agree *in Quality*, but) *A natural Perſon ſo related to another Natural perſon, as that what he doth and ſuffereth, Is or Hath, is limitedly to certain ends and uſes as effectual as if that other perſon himſelf did and ſuffered, Were or Had numerically the ſame thing.* I obtrude not a ſenſe on others, but muſt know theirs before I can know where we differ. And if this be the meaning, we are agreed: Thus far (though I greatly diſlike their way that lay much ſtreſs on ſuch humane phraſes,) I grant the thing meant by them. Chriſts Holineſs Habitual and Actual, and his Merits and Satisfaction are as effectual to a believers Juſtification and Salvation upon the terms of the Covenant of Grace (which is ſealed by baptiſm) as if we had been, done and ſuffered the ſame our ſelves. But ſtill remember that this is only [*limitedly*] to *theſe uſes*, and on theſe *termes* and no other, and I think that this is the meaning of moſt Divines that uſe this phraſe.

But the ſenſe of thoſe men that I differ from and write againſt (the *Libertines* and *Antinomians*, and ſome others that own not thoſe names,) is this: that *A Legal Perſon is one ſo Related to anothers Natural perſon as that what he Hath, Doth, or Suffereth in ſuch a caſe*, is (not only effectual as aforeſaid to others, but) *is in itſelf ſimply Reputed or Imputed to be Morally, though not phyſically, the Habit, Act and Suffering,*

Suffering, the Merit and ſatisfactory Sacrifice of the other perſon: And ſo being the reputed Haver, Doer or *Sufferer, Meriter* or *Satisfyer himſelf, he hath abſolute right to all the proper reſults or benefits.*

And ſo a man may indeed many ways among us *Repreſent* or *Perſonate* another. If I by Law am Commanded to do this or that ſervice *per meipſum aut per alium*, I do it in the Moral or Law-ſence, becauſe the other doth it in my name and I am allowed ſo to do it. So if I appear or anſwer by any Proctor or Attorney; if the Law make it equal to my perſonal appearance and anſwer, it is ſaid that *I did it by him*: (but only ſo far as he doth it as my *Repreſenter* or *in my name*): So if I pay a debt by the hand of *my Servant* or any Meſſenger, if ſo allowed, I do it by that other. So indeed a Pupil, doth by his Guardian what his Guardian doth, only ſo far as the Law obligeth him to conſent or ſtand to it.

We did not thus our ſelves fulfil all the Law in and by Chriſt: Nor are we *thus* the *Proprietors* of his *Habitual* perfection, *Merits or Satisfaction.*

The common reaſon given by the contrary-minded is, that he was our *Surety*, or *Spouſor*, or *fidejuſſor*: and ſo we tranſlate ἔγγυος *Heb.* 7. 22. and I remember not any other text of Scripture allegable for that title. But this word doth not neceſſarily ſignifie any ſuch *Repreſenter of our Perſons* as aforeſaid. Nay when he is called thus the *fidejuſſor of a better Covenant*, it ſeemeth plain that it is Gods Covenant as ſuch, and ſo Gods *Sponſor* that is meant; and as *Grotius* ſaith *Moſes pro Deo ſpoſpondit in Lege Veteri: Jeſus pro Deo in Lege Novâ: Lex utraque & pactum continet, promiſſa habet. Sponſorem dare ſolent minùs nati: & Moſes & Deus hominibus*

but melius nati erant quam Deum qui inconſpicuus. So alſo Dr. *Hamond* [*He was Sponſor and Surety for God, that it ſhould be made good to us on Gods part, on Condition that we performed that which was required of us*:] And here they that tranſlate διαθήκη a Teſtament, never intended that it was our *Part* of the Covenant that is meant by a *Teſtament*: But (the moſt Judicious expoſitor,) "Mr. *Lawſon* on the "text, truly ſaith [The Scriptures of *Moſes* and the "Prophets tranſlated into Greek will tell us; That "διαθήκη always ſignifieth a Law or a Covenant, "and for the moſt part both: ſo it doth in the "writings of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts where it "ſeldom ſignifieth the laſt Will and Teſtament of a "man. The ſame thing is a Law in reſpect of the "precepts, &c. ἔγγυος turned Surety, ſignifieth "one that undertaketh for another to ſee ſomething "paid or performed: And though the word is not "found in the New Teſtament except in this place, "&c. But *Varnius* tells us that ἔγγυος is μεσίτης, "a Mediator; and ſo it is taken here as it's expounded by the Apoſtle in the Chapter following: "And becauſe a Prieſt doth undertake to procure "from God, both the Confirmation and performance "of the promiſes to the people, and to that end me"diates between both; therefore he is a Surety and "Mediator of the Covenant, and in this reſpect the "Surety and Mediator of the Covenant is a Prieſt.] So *Calvin* (though almoſt paſſing it by) ſeemeth to intimate that which I think is the truth, that Chriſt is called ἔγγυος of Gods Covenant from the *ſacerdotal appropinquation*, mentioned *verſ.* 19. &c.

"And *Marlorate* after *Theophilact*, *Sponſorem pro Me*"*diatore & interceſſore poſuit.*

"So

" So *Pareus in loc. Est novi fœderis Sponsor Christus,*
" *quia novum fœdus sanguine & morte sua obsignavit.*

So the *Dutch Annot.* and many others, besides the Ancients, by a *Sponsor*, tell us is meant a *Mediator.*

And we grant that a Mediator is *not of one*, but doth somewhat on the behalf of *both parties.* But that as Mediator he Is, Hath, Doth, Suffereth, Merit-teth, Satisfyeth; so as the Representer or person of each believer, as that every such Person is supposed in Law to have *Been*, *Done*, *Suffered*, *Merited*, thus in and by the *Mediator*, is neither signified by this or any other text.

2. And they that distinguish of a Natural and Political Person, do but darken the case by an ill-expressed distinction, which indeed is not of two sorts of *Persons*, but between *Reality* and *Acceptation*, taking *Person* properly for *a Natural Person*: It's one thing to be such a *Person*, and another thing to have the *Act*, *Passion*, *Merit*, &c. *Accepted* for that other *Person*: And this latter signifieth, either 1. That it was done by *the other person mediately*, as being *a cheif Cause acting by his Instrument.* 2. Or that it was *done for that other Person* by another. The first is our denyed sence, and the second our affirmed sence.

Among us *Sureties* and *Sponsors* are of several sorts: *Grotius de Jure Belli* tells you of another sense of *Sponsion* in the Civil Law, than is pertinent to the objectors use: And in Baptism the same word, hath had divers senses as used by persons of different intentions. The time was when the Sponsor was not at all taken for the *Political Person* (as you call it) of *Parent* or *Child*, nor spake as *their Instrument*, in *their name*: But was a Third person,

who

who (becauſe many parents *Apoſtatized*, and more *Died* in the Childs minority) did paſs his word, 1. *That the Parent was a credible Perſon*, 2. That if he *Dyed* ſo ſoon or *Apoſtatized*, he himſelf would undertake the Chriſtian Education of the Child. But the *Parent* himſelf was *Sponſor for the Child* in a ſtricter ſenſe, (as alſo Adopting Pro-parents were, & as ſome take God-fathers to be now,) that is, they were taken for ſuch, whoſe Reaſon, will and word, we authoriſed to diſpoſe of the Child as obligingly, as if it had been done by his own reaſon will and word, ſo be it, it were but *For his good*, and the Child did own it when he came to age: And ſo they were to ſpeak as in the Childs name, as if Nature or Charity made them his Repreſenters, in the Judgment of many. (Though others rather think that they were to ſpeak as in their own perſons, *e.g.* I dedicate this Child to God, and enter him into the Covenant as obliged by my Conſent.) But this ſenſe of *Sponſion* is nothing to the preſent Caſe.

They that lay all upon the very Name of a *Surety* as if the word had but one ſignification, and all *Sureties* properly repreſented the perſon of the Principal obliged perſon, do deal very deceitfully: There are *Sureties* or *Sponſors*, 1. For ſome Duty, 2. For Debt, 3. For Puniſhment. 1. It is one thing to undertake that another ſhall do a Commanded duty: 2. It's another thing to undertake that elſe I will do it for him: 3. It's another thing to be Surety that he ſhall pay a Debt, or elſe I will pay it for him: 4. It's another thing to undertake that he ſhall ſuffer a penalty, or elſe to ſuffer for him, or make a Valuable Compenſation.

1. And it's one kind of Surety that becometh a

ſecond

ſecond party in the bond, and ſo maketh *himſelf a debtor*; 2. And its another ſort of Surety that *undertaketh only the Debt afterward voluntarily as a Friend*; who may pay it on ſuch Conditions as he and the Creditor think meet, without the Debtors knowledg. Every Novice that will but open *Calvin* may ſee that *Fidejuſſor* and *Sponſor* are words of very various ſignification; and that they ſeldom or never ſignifie the *Perſon Natural* or *Political* (as you call it) of the *Principal*: *Sponſor eſt qui ſponte & non rogatus pro alio promittit, ut Accurſ. vel quicunque ſpondet, maximè pro aliis: Fidejubere eſt ſuo periculo fore id, de quo agitur, recipere: Vel, fidem ſuam pro alio obligare.* He is called *Adpromiſſor*, and he is *Debtor*, but not the ſame *perſon* with the *Principal*, but his promiſe is *acceſſoria obligatio, non principalis.* Therefore *Fidejuſſor ſive Interceſſor non eſt conveniendus, niſi prius debitore principali convento: Fidejuſſores a correis ita differunt, quod hi ſuo & proprio morbo laborant, illi vero alieno tenentur: Quare fidejuſſori magis ſuccurrendum cenſent: Veniâ namque digni ſunt qui alienâ tenentur Culpâ, cujuſmodi ſunt fidejuſſores pro alieno debito obligati, inquit* Calv.

There muſt be ſomewhat more than the bare name ἐγγυος once uſed of Chriſt as Mediator of Gods Covenant, or the name of a *Surety* as now uſed among men, that muſt go to prove that the Mediator and the ſeveral ſinners are the ſame *Legal Perſons* in Gods account.

But ſeeing *Legal-Perſonality* is but a *Relation* of our *Natural perſon*, to another *Natural perſon*, that we may not quarrel and tear the Church when really

we

we differ not 1. Let our agreement be noted. 2. Our difference intelligibly ſtated.

1. It is granted (not only by *Dr. Tullie*, but others that accurately handle the Controverſie,) 1. That Chriſt and the Believer never were nor are our Natural perſon; and that no union with him maketh us to be Chriſt, or God, nor him to be *Peter*, *John* or *Paul*, &c. That we know of no third ſort of *Natural perſon*, (which is neither Jeſus, nor *Peter*, *John*, &c.) But compoſed of both united, which is conſtituted by our Union. For though it be agreed on, that the ſame Spirit that is in Chriſt is (operatively) alſo in all his Members, and that therefore our *Communion* with him is more than *Relative*, and that from this *Real-Communion*, the name of a *Real-Union* may be uſed; yet here the *Real-Union* is not *Perſonal* (as the ſame Sun quickeneth and illuminateth a Bird and a Frog and a Plant, and yet maketh them not our perſon:) Therefore he that will ſay we are *Phyſically* one with Chriſt, and not only Relatively, but tell us [*ONE What?*] and make his words Intelligible; and muſt deny that we are *ONE PERSON*: and that by that time we are not like to be found differing. But remember that while *Phyſical Communion*, is confeſſed by all, what *UNION* we ſhall from thence be ſaid to have (this Foundation being agreed on) is like to prove but a queſtion, *de realitione & nomine.*

2. Yea all the world muſt acknowledg that the whole Creation is *quoad præſentiam & derivationem* more dependant on God than the fruit is on the *Tree*, or the Tree on the Earth, and that God is the inſeperate Cauſe of our *Being*, *Station*, *and Life*; And

And yet this natural intimateneſs, and influx, and cauſality, maketh not GOD and every Creature abſolutely or perſonally *One*.

3. It is agreed therefore that *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* is neither *materially* nor *formally*, any *Accident* of our *natural Perſons*; (and an *Accident* it is) *unleſs* it can be reduced to that of *Relation*. 1. The *Habits* of our Perſon, cannot poſſibly be the habits of another inherently. 2. The *actions* of one *cannot* poſſibly be the *actions* of another, as the Agent, unleſs as that other as a *principal Cauſe*, acteth by the other as his *Inſtrument* or ſecond Cauſe. 3. The ſame *fundamentum relationis* inherent in One Perſon, is not inherent in another if it be a perſonal Relation: And ſo the ſame individual Relation that is one Mans, cannot numerically be another Mans, by the ſame ſort of in-being, propriety, or adherence. Two Brothers have a Relation in *kind the ſame*, but not *unmerically*.

4. And it is agreed that God judgeth not falſly, and therefore taketh not Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to be any more or otherwiſe *ours*, than indeed it is; nor imputeth it to us erroneouſly.

5. Yet it is commonly agreed, that *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* is *OURS* in ſome ſenſe; And ſo far is juſtly *reputed Ours*, or *imputed* to us as being *Ours*.

6. And this ambiguous ſyallable [*OURS*] (enough to ſet another Age of Wranglers into bitter Church-tearing ſtrife, if not hindred by ſome that will call them to explain an ambiguous word) is it that muſt be underſtood to end this Controverſie. *Propriety* is the thing ſignified. 1. In the ſtricteſt ſenſe that is called *Ours*, which inhereth in

us, or that which is *done* by us. 2. In a larger (Moral) ſenſe, that which a Man as the *principal Cauſe*, doth by another as his *Inſtrument*, by authorizing, commanding, perſwading, &c. 3. In a yet larger ſenſe that may be called *OURS*, which a third perſon doth partly *inſtead* of what we ſhould *have done* (*had*, *or ſuffered*) and partly for our *uſe*, or *benefit*. 4. In a yet larger ſenſe that may be called *OURS*, which another *hath*, or *doth*, or *ſuffereth* for our *Benefit*, (though not in our ſtead) and which will be for our good, (as that which a Friend or Father hath, is his Friends or Childs, and *all things* are *Ours*, whether *Paul*, or &c. and the Godly are owners of the World, in as much as God *will uſe all for* their good).

7. It is therefore a *Relation* which Chriſt's Righteouſneſs hath to us, or we to it, that muſt here be meant by the word [*OURS*]: Which is our *RIGHT* or *Jus*; And that is acknowledged to be no *Jus* or Right to it in the foreſaid denied ſenſe; And it is agreed that *ſome Right* it is. Therefore, to underſtand what it is, the *Titulus ſeu Fundamentum juris* muſt be known.

8. And here it is agreed; 1. That we are before Converſion or Faith related to Chriſt as part of the Redeemed World, of whom it is ſaid, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *That God was in Chriſt, reconciling the World to himſelf, not imputing to them their ſins*, &c. 2. That we are after Faith related to Chriſt as his Covenanted People, Subjects, Brethren, Friends, and Political Members; yea, as ſuch that have *Right to*, and *Poſſeſſion of* Real Communion with him by his Spirit: And that we have then Right to *Pardon*, Juſtification, and Adoption, (or have Right

Right to *Impunity* in the promiſed degree, and to the *Spirits Grace*, and the *Love of God*, and *Heavenly Glory*). This Relation to *Chriſt* and this *Right*, to the *Benefits* of his *Righteouſneſs* are agreed on: And conſequently that his *Righteouſneſs* is *OURS*, and ſo may be called, as far as the foreſaid *Relations* and *Rights* import.

II. Now a Relation (as *Ockam* hath fully proved) having no real entity, beſide the *quid abſolutum*, which is the *Subject*, *Fundamentum*, or *Terminus*, he that yet raileth at his Brother as not ſaying enough, or not being herein ſo wiſe as he, and will maintain that yet *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* is further *OURS*, muſt name the *Fundamentum* of that *Right* or *Propriety*: What more is it that you mean? I think the make-bates have here little probability of fetching any more Fuel to their Fire, or turning Chriſt's Goſpel into an occaſion of ſtrife and mutual enmity, if they will but be driven to a diſtinct explication, and will not make *confuſion* and *ambiguous* words their defence and weapons. If you ſet your quarrelſome Brains on work, and ſtudy as hard as you can for matter of Contention, it will not be eaſie for you to find it, unleſs you will raze out the names of *Popery*, *Socinianiſm*, *Arminianiſm*, or *Solifidianiſm*, Hereſie, &c. inſtead of real Difference. But if the *angrieſt* and *lowdeſt* Speakers be in the right, *Bedlam* and *Billingſgate* may be the moſt Orthodox places.

Briefly, 1. The foreſaid Benefits of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, (Habitual, Active and Paſſive) as a Meritorious, Satisfactory, Purchaſing Cauſe, are ours.

2. To say that the Benefits are *Ours*, importeth that the *Causal Righteousness* of Christ is related to *us, and the Effects* as *such a Cause:* and so is it self *OURS*, in that sense, that is, so related.

3. And Christ himself is *OURS*, as related to us as our Saviour; the Procurer and Giver of those Benefits. And do you mean any more by [*OURS*]?

If you say that we deny any *Benefits* of Christ's Righteousness which you assert, name what they are. If you say that we deny any true *Fundamentum juris*, or reason of our title, name what that is. If you say that we deny any true Relation to Christ himself, tell us what it is: If you cannot, say that you are agreed.

1. If you say that the Benefit denied by us, is that we are judged by God, as those that (habitually and actively) have perfectly fulfilled the Law of Innocency our selves, though not in our natural Persons, yet by Christ as representing us, and so shall be justified by that Law of Innocency as the Fulfiller of it, we do deny it, and say, That you subvert the Gospel, and the true Benefits which we have by Christ.

2. If you say that we deny that God esteemeth or reputeth us, to be the very Subjects of that Numerical Righteousness, in the Habits, Acts, Passion or Relation, which was in the Person of Christ, or to have *done*, *suffered*, or *merited our selves* in and by him, as the proper Representer of our Persons therein; and so that his Righteousness is thus imputed to us as truly in it self *our own propriety*, we do deny it, and desire you to do so also, lest you deny Christianity.

2. If you blame us for saying, That we had or have no such Relation to Christ, as to our Instrument, or the proper full Representer of each Believers particular Person, by whom we did truly fulfil the Law of Innocency, habitually and actively, and satisfied, merited, &c. We do still say so, and wish you to consider what you say, before you proceed to say the contrary.

But if you come not up to this, where will you find a difference.

Object. 2. *Christ is called The Lord our Righteousness, and he is made Righteousness to us, and we are made the Righteousness of God in him,* 2 Cor. 5. 21, &c. *And by the Obedience of one, many are made Righteous.*

Answ. And are we not all agreed of all this? But can his Righteousness be *Ours* no way but by the foresaid Personation Representating? How prove you that? He is *Our Righteousness,* and his *Obedience maketh us Righteous.*

1. Because the very Law of Innocency which we dishonoured and broke by sin, is perfectly fulfilled and honoured by him, as a Mediator, to repair the injury done by our breaking it.

2. In that he suffered to satisfie Justice for our sin.

3. In that hereby he hath merited of God the Father, all that *Righteousness* which we are truly the Subjects of, whether it be Relative, or Qualitative, or Active; that is, 1. Our Right to Christ in Union to the Spirit, to Impunity, and to Glory; And, 2. The Grace of the Spirit by which we are made Holy, and fulfil the Conditions of the Law

of Grace. We are the *Subjects of these*, and he is the *Minister*, and the *meritorious Cause* of our *Life*, is well called *Our Righteousness*, and by many the *material Cause*, (as our own perfect Obedience would have been) because it is the *Matter* of that Merit.

4. And also Christ's Intercession with the Father, still procureth all this as the Fruit of his Merits.

5. And we are Related as his Members (though not parts of his *Person* as such) to him that thus merited for us.

6. And we have the Spirit from him as our Head.

7. And he is our Advocate, and will justifie us as our Judg.

8. And all this is *God's Righteousness* designed for us, and thus far given us by him.

9. And the perfect Justice and Holiness of God, is thus glorified in us through Christ. And are not all these set together enough to prove, that we justly own all asserted by these Texts? But if you think that you have a better sense of them, you must better prove it, than by a bare naming of the words.

Object. 3. *If Christ's Righteousness be Ours, then we are Righteous by it as Ours; and so God reputeth it but as it is: But it is Ours; 1. By our Union with him. 2. And by his Gift, and so consequently by God's Imputation.*

Answ. 1. I have told you before that it is confessed to be *Ours*; but that this syllable *OURS* hath many senses; and I have told you in what sense,

and

and how far it is *OURS*, and in that ſenſe we are juſtified by it, and it is truly imputed to us, or reputed or reckoned as *OURS*: But not in their ſenſe that claim a ſtrict Propriety in the ſame numerical Habits, Acts, Sufferings, Merits, Satisfaction, which was in Chriſt, or done by him, as if they did become *Subjects* of the *ſame Accidents*; or, as if they did it by an inſtrumental ſecond Cauſe. But it is *OURS*, as being done by a Mediator, inſtead of what we ſhould have done, and as the Meritorious Cauſe of all our Righteouſneſs and Benefits, which are freely given us for the ſake hereof.

2. He that is made Righteouſneſs to us, is alſo made Wiſdom, Sanctification and Redemption to us: but that *ſub genere Cauſæ Efficientis, non autem Cauſæ Conſtitutivæ*: We are the Subjects of the ſame numerical *Wiſdom* and *Holineſs* which is in Chriſt. Plainly the Queſtion is, Whether Chriſt or his Righteouſneſs, Holineſs, Merits, and Satisfaction, be *Our Righteouſneſs Conſtitutively*, or only *Efficiently*? The *Matter* and *Form* of Chriſt's Perſonal Righteouſneſs is *OURS*, as an Efficient Cauſe, but it is neither the neareſt *Matter*, or the *Form* of that Righteouſneſs which is *OURS* as the Subjects of it; that is, It is not a Conſtitutive Cauſe nextly material, or formal of it.

3. If our Union with Chriſt were Perſonal, (making us the ſame Perſon) then doubtleſs the Accidents of his Perſon would be the Accidents of ours, and ſo not only Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, but every Chriſtians would be each of Ours: But that is not ſo. Nor is it ſo given us by him.

Object. 4. *You do ſeem to ſuppoſe that we have none of that kind of Righteouſneſs at all, which conſiſteth in perfect Obedience and Holineſs, but only a Right to Impunity and Life, with an imperfect Inherent Righteouſneſs in our ſelves: The Papiſts are forced to confeſs, that a Righteouſneſs we muſt have which conſiſteth in a conformity to the preceptive part of the Law, and not only the Retributive part: But they ſay, It is in our ſelves, and we ſay it is Chriſt's imputed to us.*

Anſw. 1. The Papiſts (*e. g.* Learned *Vaſquer* in *Rom.* 5.) talk ſo ignorantly of the differences of the Two Covenants, or the Law of Innocency and of Grace, as if they never underſtood it. And hence they 1. ſeem to take no notice of the Law of Innocency, or of Nature now commanding our perfect Obedience, but only of the Law of Grace. 2. Therefore they uſe to call thoſe *Duties* but Perfections; and the Commands that require them, but *Counſels*, where they are not made Conditions of Life: and ſins not bringing Damnation, ſome call Venial, (a name not unfit) and ſome expound that as properly *no ſin*, but analogically. 3. And hence they take little notice, when they treat of Juſtification, of the *Remitting of Puniſhment*; but by *remitting Sin*, they uſually mean the deſtroying the *Habits*: As if they forgot all *actual ſin paſt*, or thought that it deſerved no Puniſhment, or needed no Pardon: For a paſt Act in it ſelf is now nothing, and is capable of no Remiſſion but Forgiveneſs. 4. Or when they do talk of Guilt of Puniſhment, they lay ſo much of the Remedy on Man's *Satisfaction*, as if Chriſt's Satisfaction and Merits

Merits had procured no pardon, or at leaſt, of no temporal part of Puniſhment. 5. And hence they ignorantly revile the Proteſtants, as if we denied all *Perſonal Inherent Righteouſneſs*, and truſted only to the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs as juſtifying wicked unconverted Men: The Papiſts therefore ſay not that we are innocent or ſinleſs, (really or imputatively); no not when they dream of *Perfection* and *Supererrogation*, unleſs when they denominate *Sin* and *Perfection* only from the Condition of the Law of Grace, and not that of Innocency.

2. But if any of them do as you ſay, no wonder if they and you contend: If one ſay, We *are Innocent*, or *Sinleſs* in reality, and the *other*, *we are ſo* by *Imputation*, when we are ſo no way at all (but ſinners *really*, and ſo reputed); what Reconciliation is there to be expected, till both lay by their Errour?

Object. 5. *How can God accept him as juſt, who is really and reputedly a Sinner? This diſhonoureth his Holineſs and Juſtice.*

Anſw. Not ſo: Cannot God pardon ſin, upon a valuable Merit and Satisfaction of a Mediator? And though he judg us not *perfect* now, and accept us not as ſuch; yet 1. now he judgeth us Holy, 2. and the Members of a perfect Saviour; 3. and will make us perfect and ſpotleſs, and then ſo judg us, having waſhed us from our ſins in the Blood of the Lamb.

Object. 6. *Thus you make the* Reatus Culpæ, *not pardoned at all, but only the* Reatus Pœnæ.

Anſw.

Anſw. 1. If by *Reatus Culpæ* be meant the Relation of a Sinner as he is *Revera Peccator*, and ſo to be *Reus*, is to be *Revera ipſe qui peccavit*; then we muſt conſider what you mean by *Pardon:* For if you mean the *nullifying* of ſuch a *Guilt*, (or *Reality*) it is impoſſible, becauſe *neceſſiate exiſtentiæ*, he that hath once ſinned, will be ſtill the Perſon that ſinned, while he is a Perſon, and the Relation of *one that ſinned* will cleave to him: It will eternally be a true Propoſition, [*Peter* and *Paul* did ſin]; But if by *Pardon* you mean, the *pardoning* of all the *penalty* which for that ſin is due, (*damni vel ſenſus*) ſo *it is pardoned*; and this is indeed the *Reatus pœnæ:* Not only the *Penalty*, but the *Dueneſs* of that Penalty, or the Obligation to it, is remitted and nullified.

2. Therefore if by *Reatus Culpæ* you mean an *Obligation* to *Puniſhment for that Fault*, this being indeed the *Reatus pœnæ*, as is ſaid, is done away. So that we are, I think, all agreed *de re*; And *de nomine* you may ſay that the *Reatus Culpæ* is done away or remitted, or not, in ſeveral ſenſes: *In ſe*, it is not nullified, nor can be: But as *Dueneſs* of Puniſhment followeth, that is pardoned.

Object. 7. *You have ſaid, That though we were not perſonally but ſeminally in* Adam *when he ſinned, yet when we are Perſons, we are Perſons guilty of his actual ſin: And ſo we muſt be Perſons that are Partakers of Chriſt's Actual Righteouſneſs, and not only of its Effects, as ſoon as we are Believers. For Chriſt being the Second* Adam, *and publick Perſon, we have our part in his Righteouſneſs, as truly and as much as in* Adam's *ſin.*

Anſw

Anſw. 1. We muſt firſt underſtand how far *Adam*'s ſin is ours: And firſt I have elſewhere proved that our *Covenant-Union and Intereſt* ſuppoſeth our *Natural Union* and *Intereſt*; and that it is an adding to God's Word and Covenant, to ſay, That he covenanted that *Adam* ſhould perſonate each one of his Poſterity in God's imputation or account, any further than they were naturally in him; and ſo that his *innocency or ſin* ſhould be reputed theirs, *as far* as if they had been perſonally the Subjects and Agents. The *Perſon* of *Peter* never was in *Reality* or *God's Reputation*, the *Perſon of* Adam. (Nor *Adam*'s Perſon the Perſon of *Peter*): But *Peter* being virtually and ſeminally in *Adam*, when he ſinned, his Perſon is derived from *Adam*'s Perſon: And ſo *Peter*'s Guilt is not numerically the ſame with *Adams*, but the Accident of another Subject, and therefore another Accident, derived with the Perſon from *Adam* (and from nearer Parents). The *Fundamentum* of that *Relation* (of Guilt) is the *Natural Relation* of the Perſon to *Adam*, (and ſo it is *Relatio in Relatione fundata*). The *Fundamentum* of that *natural Relation*, is *Generation*, yea a *ſeries* of Generations from *Adam* to that Perſon: And *Adam*'s Generation being the Communication of a *Guilty Nature with perſonality* to his Sons and Daughters, is the *fundamentum* next following his *perſonal Fault and Guilt* charged on him by the Law: So that here is a long *ſeries* of efficient Cauſes, bringing down from *Adam's Perſon and Guilt* a *diſtinct numerical Perſon* and *Guilt* of every one of his later Poſterity.

2. And it is not the ſame ſort of Guilt, or ſo plenary, which is on us, for *Adam*'s Act, as was on

on him, but a Guilt Analogical, or of another ſort: that is, He was guilty of being the *wilful ſinning Perſon*, and ſo are not we, but only of being *Perſons whoſe Being is derived by Generation from the wilful ſinning Perſons*, (beſides the guilt of our own inherent pravity): That is, *The Relation is ſuch which our Perſons have to* Adam's *Perſon, as make it juſt with God to deſert us, and to puniſh us for that and our pravity together.* This is our *Guilt* of Original ſin.

3. And this Guilt cometh to us by Natural Propagation, and reſultancy from our very Nature ſo propagated. And now let us conſider of our contrary Intereſt in Chriſt.

And, 1. Our Perſons are not the ſame as Chriſt's Perſon, (nor Chriſt's as ours) nor ever ſo judged or accounted of God.

2. Our *Perſons* were not naturally, ſeminally, and virtually in Chriſt's Perſon (any further than he is Creator and Cauſe of all things) as they were in *Adams*.

3. Therefore we derive not Righteouſneſs from him by Generation, but by his voluntary Donation or Contract.

4. As he became not our Natural Parent, ſo our Perſons not *being in Chriſt* when he obeyed, are not *reputed to have been in him naturally*, or to have obeyed in and by him.

5. If Chriſt and we are reputed one Perſon, either he *obeyed* in our *Perſon*, or we *in his*, or *both*. If he *obeyed* as a *Reputed Sinner* in the Perſon of each Sinner, his Obedience could not be meritorious, according to the Law of Innocency, which required ſinleſs Perfection; And he being ſuppo-

ſed

ſed to have broken the Law in our Perſons, could not ſo be ſuppoſed to keep it. If we obeyed in his *Perſon*, we obeyed as *Mediators*, or Chriſt's, of which before.

6. But as is oft ſaid, Chriſt our Mediator undertook in a middle Perſon to reconcile God and Man, (not by bringing God erroneouſly to judg that he or we were what we are not, or did what we did not, but) by *being*, *doing*, and *ſuffering* for us, that in *his own Perſon*, which ſhould better anſwer God's Ends and Honour, than if we had done and ſuffered in our Perſons, that hereby he might *merit* a free Gift of *Pardon* and *Life* (with himſelf) to be given by a Law of Grace to believing penitent Accepters. And ſo our Righteouſneſs, as is oft opened, is a Relation reſulting at once from all theſe Cauſes as fundamental to it, *viz.* Chriſt's Meritorious Righteouſneſs, his free Gift thereupon, and our Relation to him as Covenanters or United Believers. And this is agreed on.

Object. 8. *As Chriſt is a Sinner by imputation of our ſin, ſo we are Righteous, by the imputation of his Righteouſneſs. But it is our ſin it ſelf that is imputed to Chriſt: Therefore it is his Righteouſneſs it ſelf that is imputed to us.*

Anſw. 1. Chriſt's Perſon was not the Subject of our perſonal Relative *Guilt*, much leſs of our *Habits* or *Acts*.

2. God did not judg him to have been ſo.

3. Nay, Chriſt had no *Guilt* of the *ſame kind* reckoned to be on him; elſe thoſe unmeet Speeches, uſed raſhly by ſome, would be true, *viz.* That Chriſt was the greateſt Murderer, Adulterer, Idolater, Blaſphe-

Blaſphemer, Thief, *&c.* in all the World, and conſequently more hated of God, (for God muſt needs hate a ſinner as ſuch). To be guilty of ſin as we are, is to be reputed truly to be the Perſon that committed it: But ſo was not Chriſt, and therefore not ſo to be reputed. Chriſt was but the Mediator that undertook to ſuffer for our ſins, that we might be forgiven; and not for his *own* ſin, real or juſtly reputed: Expoſitors commonly ſay that to be [*made ſin for us*], is but to be made [*a Sacrifice for ſin*]. So that Chriſt took upon him neither our *numerical guilt* of ſin it ſelf, nor any of the ſame *ſpecies*; but only our *Reatum Pœnæ*, or *Debt* of *Puniſhment*, or (leſt the Wrangler make a verbal quarrel of it) our *Reatum Culpæ non qua talem & in ſe, ſed quatenus eſt fundamentum Reatus pœnæ:* And ſo his *Righteouſneſs* is ours; not *numerically* the ſame Relation that he was the Subject of made that Relation to us; nor yet a *Righteouſneſs* of the ſame *Species* as Chriſt's is given us at all, (for his was a *Mediators Righteouſneſs*, conſiſting in, 1. *perfect Innocency*; 2. And that in the *Works* of the *Jewiſh Law*, which bind us not; 3. And in doing his *peculiar Works*, as *Miracles*, *Reſurrection*, &c. which were all *His Righteouſneſs* as a conformity to *that Law*, and performance of that *Covenant*, which was made with, and to him *as Mediator*). But his Righteouſneſs is the *Meritorious Cauſe* and *Reaſon* of another Righteouſneſs or Juſtification (diſtinct from his) freely given us by the Father and himſelf by his Covenant. So that here indeed the Similitude much cleareth the Matter; And they that will not blaſpheme Chriſt by making *guilt of ſin it ſelf* in its *formal Relation* to be his own, and ſo Chriſt

Christ to be *formally* as great a sinner as all the Redeemed set together, and they that will not overthrow the Gospel, by making us formally as Righteous as Christ in kind and measure, must needs be agreed with us in this part of the Controversie.

Object. 9. *When you infer, That if we are reckoned to have perfectly obeyed in and by Christ, we cannot be again bound to obey our selves afterward, nor be guilty of any sin; you must know that it's true, That we cannot be bound to obey to the same ends as Christ did, (which is to redeem us, or to fulfil the Law of Works) But yet we must obey to other ends,* viz. *Ingratitude, and to live to God, and to do good, and other such like.*

Answ. 1. This is very true, That we are not bound to obey to all the same ends that Christ did, as to redeem the World, nor to fulfil the Law of Innocency. But hence it clearly followeth that *Christ obeyed not* in each of our Persons legally, but in the Person of a Mediator, seeing his due Obedience and ours have so different *Ends*, and a different formal Relation, (his being a conformity proximately to the Law, given him as Mediator) that they are not so much as of the same *Species*, much less numerically the same.

2. And this fully proveth that we are not reckoned to have perfectly obeyed in and by him: For else we could not be yet obliged to obey, though to other ends than he was: For either this *Obedience* of *Gratitude* is a Duty or not; If not, it is not truly *Obedience*, nor the omission sin: If yea, then *that Duty* was made a Duty by some Law: And if by a Law we are now bound to obey *in gratitude* (or for

for what ends ſoever) either we do all that we are ſo bound to do, or not. If we do it (or any of it) then to ſay that we did it twice, once by Chriſt, and once by our ſelves, is to ſay that we were bound to do it twice, and then Chriſt did not all that we were bound to, but half: But what Man is he that ſinneth not? Therefore ſeeing it is certain, that no Man doth all that he is bound to do by the Goſpel, (in the time and meaſure of his *Faith, Hope, Love, Fruitfulneſs*, &c.) it followeth that he is a ſinner, and that he is not ſuppoſed to have done all that by Chriſt which he failed in, both becauſe he was bound to do it himſelf, and becauſe he is a ſinner for not doing it.

3. Yea, the Goſpel binds us to that which Chriſt could not do for us, it being a Contradiction. Our great Duties are, 1. To believe in a Saviour. 2. To improve all the parts of his Mediation by a Life of Faith. 3. To repent of our ſins. 4. To mortifie ſinful Luſts in our ſelves. 5. To fight by the Spirit againſt our fleſh. 6. To confeſs our ſelves ſinners. 7. To pray for pardon. 8. To pray for that Grace which we culpably want. 9. To love God for redeeming us. 10. Sacramentally to covenant with Chriſt, and to receive him and his Gifts; with many ſuch like; which Chriſt was not capable of doing in and on his own Perſon for us, though as Mediator he give us Grace to do them, and pray for the pardon of our ſins, as in our ſelves.

4. But the Truth which this Objection intimateth, we all agree in, *viz.* That the Mediator perfectly kept the Law of Innocency, that the keeping of that Law might not be neceſſary to our Salvation,

on, (and ſo ſuch Righteouſneſs neceſſary in our ſelves) but that we might be pardoned for want of perfect Innocency, and be ſaved upon our ſincere keeping of the Law of Grace, becauſe the Law of Innocency was kept by our Mediator, and thereby the Grace of the New-Covenant merited, and by it Chriſt, Pardon, Spirit and Life, by him freely given to Believers.

Object. 10. *The ſame Perſon may be really a ſinner in himſelf, and yet perfectly innocent in Chriſt, and by imputation.*

Anſw. Remember that you ſuppoſe here the *Perſon* and *Subject* to be the ſame Man: And then that the two contrary Relations of *perfect Innocency*, or *guiltleſneſs*, and *guilt of any*, (yea much ſin) can be conſiſtent in him, is a groſs contradiction. Indeed he may be guilty, and not guilty in ſeveral partial reſpects; but a *perfection* of *guiltleſneſs* excludeth all guilt. But we are guilty of many a ſin after Converſion, and need a Pardon. All that you ſhould ſay is this, *We are ſinners our ſelves, but we have a Mediator that ſinned not, who merited Pardon and Heaven for ſinners.*

2. But if you mean that God reputeth us to be perfectly innocent when we are not, becauſe that Chriſt was ſo, it is to impute Error to God: He reputeth no Man to be otherwiſe than he is: But he doth indeed firſt give, and then impute a Righteouſneſs Evangelical to us, inſtead of perfect Innocency, which ſhall as certainly bring us to Glory; and that is, He giveth us both the Renovation of

his Spirit, (to Evangelical Obedience) and a Right by free gift to Pardon and Glory for the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt that merited it; And this thus given us, he reputeth to be an acceptable Righteouſneſs in us.

CHAP. VI.

Animadverſions on ſome of Dr. T. Tullies *Strictures.*

§. 1. I Suppoſe the Reader deſireth not to be wearied with an examination of all Dr. *Tullies* words, which are defective in point of Truth, Juſtice, Charity, Ingenuity, or Pertinency to the Matter, but to ſee an anſwer to thoſe that by appearance of pertinent truth do require it, to diſabuſe the incautelous Readers; Though ſomewhat by the way may be briefly ſaid for my own Vindication. And this Tractate being conciliatory, I think meet here to leave out moſt of the *words*, and *perſonal* part of his contendings, and alſo to leave that which concerneth the *intereſt of Works* (as they are pleaſed to call *Man's performance of the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace*) in our Juſtification, to a fitter place, *viz.* To annex what I think needful to my friendly Conference with Mr. *Chriſtopher Cartwright* on the Subject, which Dr. *Tullies* Aſſault perſwadeth me to publiſh.

§. 2.

§. 2. *pag.* 71. *Juſtif. Paulin.* This Learned Doctor ſaith, [*The Scripture mentioneth no Juſtification* in foro Dei *at all, but that One, which is Abſolution from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law.*

Anſw. 1. If this be untrue, it's pity ſo worthy a Man ſhould unworthily uſe it againſt peace and concord. If it be true, I crave his help for the expounding of ſeveral Texts.

Exod. 23. 6, 7. *Thou ſhalt not wreſt the Judgment of thy Poor in his Cauſe: Keep thee far from a falſe Matter, and the Innocent and Righteous ſlay thou not; for I will not juſtifie the wicked*]. Is the meaning only, I will not abſolve the wicked from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law (of Innocency)? Or is it not rather, [I will not misjudg the wicked to be juſt, nor allow his wickedneſs, nor yet allow thee ſo to do, nor leave thee unpuniſhed for thy unrighteous judgment, but will condemn thee if thou condemn the Juſt].

Job 25. 4. *How then can Man be juſtified with God?* or, *How can he be clean that is born of a Woman?* Is the ſenſe, [*How can Man be abſolved from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law?*] Or rather, [How can he be maintained Innocent?]

Pſal. 143. 2. *In thy ſight ſhall no Man living be juſtified.* Is the ſenſe, [*No Man living ſhall be abſolved from the Maledictory ſentence of the Law?* Then we are all loſt for ever: Or rather no Man ſhall be found and maintained Innocent, and judged *one that deſerved not puniſhment*]; (Therefore we are not judged perfect fulfillers of that Law by another or our ſelves).

Object. *But this is for us and againſt you: for it denyeth that there is any ſuch Juſtification.*

Answ. Is our Controversie *de re*, or only *de nomine*, of the sense of the word Justifie? If *de re*, then his meaning is to maintain, That God never doth judg a Believer to be a Believer, or a Godly Man to be Godly, or a performer of the Condition of Pardon and Life to have performed it, nor will justifie any believing Saint against the false Accusations, that he is an Infidel, a wicked ungodly Man, and an Hypocrite, (or else he writeth against those that he understood not). But if the Question be (as it must be) *de nomine*, whether the word *Justifie* have any sense besides that which he appropriateth to it, then a Proposition that denieth the *Existentiam rei*, may confute his denyal of any other sense of *the word*.

So *Isa.* 43. 9, 26. *Let them bring forth their Witnesses that they may justified: Declare thou that thou mayest be justified*; that is, proved Innocent.

But I hope he will hear and reverence the Son; Matth. 12. 37. *By thy words thou shalt be Justified, and by thy words thou shalt be Condemned*] (speaking of Gods Judgment) which I think meaneth (*de re & nomine*) *Thy Righteous or unrighteous words* shall be a part of the Cause of the day, or Matter, for or according to which, thou shalt be judged obedient or disobedient to the Law of Grace, and so far just or unjust, and accordingly sentenced to Heaven or Hell, as is described *Matth.* 25. But it seems this Learned Doctor understands it only, *By thy words thou shalt be absolved* from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law, and by thy words contrarily condemned.

Luk. 18. 14. The Publican [*went down to his House justified rather than the other*]; I think not only

only [from the *Maledictory Sentence of the Law* of *Innocency*] but [*by God approved a ſincere Penitent*], and ſo a fit Subject of the other part of Juſtification.

Act 13. 30 is the Text that ſpeaketh moſt in the ſenſe he mentioneth; And yet I think it includeth more, *viz. By Chriſt*, 1. *we are not* only abſolved from that Condemnation due for our ſins; 2. but alſo we are by his repealing or ending of the *Moſaick Law* juſtified againſt the Charge of Guilt for our not obſerving it; and 3. *Auguſtine* would add, That we are by Chriſt's Spirit and Grace made juſt (that is, ſincerely Godly) by the deſtruction of thoſe inherent and adherent ſins, which the *Law* of *Moſes* could not mortifie and ſave us from, but the Spirit doth.

Rom. 2. 13. *Not the Hearers of the Law are juſt before God, but the Doers of the Law ſhall be juſtified*]. Is it only, *The Doers ſhall be Abſolved from the Maledictory Sentence, &c?* Or firſt and chiefly, *They ſhall be judged well-doers, ſo far as they do well*, and ſo approved and juſtified, ſo far as they do keep the Law? (which becauſe no Man doth perfectly, and the Law of Innocency requireth Perfection, none can be juſtified abſolutely, or to Salvation by it).

Object. *The meaning is*, (ſay ſome) *The Doers of the Law ſhould be juſtified by it*; were there any ſuch.

Anſw. That's true, of abſolute Juſtification unto Life: But that this is not all the ſenſe of the Text, the two next Verſes ſhew, where the Gentiles are pronounced partakers of ſome of that which he meaneth inclulively in doing to Juſtification: There-

fore it must include that their Actions and Persons are so *far justified*, (more or less) as they are *Doers* of the Law, as being so far actively just.

Rom. 8. 30. *Whom he justified, them he also glorified*; And 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *Ye are justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* Many Protestants, and among them *Beza* himself, expound (in the Papists and *Austins* sense of Justification) as including Sanctification also, as well as Absolution from the Curse: And so Arch Bishop *Usher* told me he understood them. As also *Tit.* 3. 7. *That being justified freely by his Grace.*

And many think so of *Rom.* 4. 5. he [*justifieth* the *Ungodly*] say they, by Converting, Pardoning, and Accepting them in Christ to Life.

And *Rom.* 8. 33. *Who shall condemn? it is* God that *justifieth*, seemeth to me more than barely to say, God *absolveth us from the Curse*, because it is set against *Man's Condemnation*, (who reproached, slandered and persecuted the Christians as evil Doers, as they did Christ, to whom they were predestinated to be conformed). And so must mean, *God will not only absolve us from his Curse*, but also justifie our Innocency against all the false Accusations of our Enemies.

And it seemeth to be spoken by the Apostle, with respect to *Isa.* 50. 8. *He is near that justifieth me, who will contend with me?* Which my reverence to this Learned Man sufficeth not to make me believe, is taken only in his sense of Absolution.

Rev. 22. 11. *He that is Righteous, let him be justified still*, (δικαιωθήτω) which not only our Translaters, but almost all Expositors take as inclusive

cluſive of Inherent Righteouſneſs, if not principally ſpeaking of it.

To ſpeak freely, I remember not one Text of Scripture that uſeth the word [*Juſtifie*] in this Doctor's ſenſe; that is, *Only for the ſaid abſolution from the Curſe of the Law:* For all thoſe other Texts that ſpeak for Juſtification by Chriſt's Grace, and Faith, *and not by the Works of the Law*, (as *Rom.* 3. 20, 24, 28, 30. and 4. 2, 5, 25. & 5. 1, 9, 16, 18. 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. *Gal.* 2. 16, 17. & 3. 8, 11, 24. & 5. 4, *&c.*) do all ſeem to me to mean, not only that [we are *abſolved from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law*], but alſo that we are firſt *made*, and then accounted Perſons firſt meet for Abſolution, and next meet for God's Acceptance of us as juſt, and as Heirs of Life Eternal, and meet for the great *Reward in Heaven:* For when the Apoſtle denieth *Juſtification* by *Works*; it is not credible that he meaneth only, that [*By the Works of the Law no Man is abſolved from the Curſe of the Law*]; But alſo, *No Man by the Works of the Law*, is before God taken for a Performer of the neceſſary Condition of Abſolution and Salvation, nor fit for his Acceptance, and for the Heavenly Reward.

Anſw. 2. But let the Reader here note, that the Doctor ſuppoſeth *James* to mean, that [*By Works a Man is abſolved from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law, and not by Faith only*]. For that *James* ſpeaks of Juſtification *in foro Dei* is paſt all doubt: And who would have thought that the Doctor had granted this of the Text of *James?* But miſtakes ſeldom agree among themſelves.

Anſw. 3. And would not any Man have thought

that this Author had pleaded for such an Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, as justifieth not only from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law, but also from the very guilt of sin as sin, we being reputed, (not only pardoned sinners, but) perfect fulfillers of the Law by Christ, and so that we are in Christ conform to the *Fac hoc* or preceptive part commanding Innocency? Who would have thought but this was his drift? If it be not, all his angry Opposition to me, is upon a mistake so foul, as reverence forbids me to name with its proper Epithets: If it be, how can the same Man hold, That we are justified as in Christ, conform *to the Precept of perfect Innocency?* And yet that *The Scripture mentioneth no Justification at all*, in foro Dei, *besides that one, which is Absolution from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law.* But still mistakes have discord with themselves.

Answ. 4. It is the judgment indeed of Mr. *Gataker*, *Wotton*, *Piscator*, *Paræus*, *Ursine*, *Wendeline*, and abundance other excellent Divines, that as sins of omission are truly sin, and *pœna damni*, or privations truly punishment; so for a sinner for his sin to be denied God's Love and Favour, Grace and Glory, is to be punished; and to be pardoned, is to have this privative punishment remitted as well as the rest; and so that Justification containeth our Right to Glory, as it is the bare forgiveness of the penalty of sin; because Death and Life, Darkness and Light are such Contraries, as that one is but the privation of the other: But this Learned Doctor seemeth to be of the commoner Opinion, that the Remission of Sin is but one part of our Justification, and that by Imputation of perfect Holiness

Holineſs and Obedience we muſt have another part, which is our *Right to the Reward*; (and I think a little Explication would end that difference). But doth he here then agree with himſelf? And to contradict the common way of thoſe with whom he joyneth? Do they not hold that Juſtification is more than an *Abſolution from the Maledictory Sentence of the Law?*

Anſw. 5. But indeed his very Deſcription by *Abſolution* is utterly ambiguous: 1. Abſolution is either by *Actual Pardon*, by the Law or Covenant of Grace; which giveth us our *Right* to *Impunity:* 2. Or by *Sentence* of the Judg, who publickly *decideth* our Caſe, and declareth our Right determinatively: Or by execution of that Sentence in actual delivering us from penalty; And who knoweth which of theſe he meaneth? This is but confuſion, to deſcribe by an unexplained equivocal word.

And who knoweth what Law he meaneth, whoſe *Maledictory Sentence* Juſtification abſolveth us from? Doth he think that the Law of Innocency, and of *Moſes*, and the Law of Grace are all one, which Scripture ſo frequently diſtinguiſheth? Or that each of them hath not its *Malediction?* If he deny this, I refer him to my full proof of it, to Mr. *Cartwright* and elſewhere. If not, we ſhould know whether he mean all, or which.

3. And what he meaneth by the Sentence of the Law is uncertain: Whether it be the Laws *Commination*, as obliging us to puniſhment, which is not a *Sentence* in the uſual proper ſenſe, but only a *virtual Sentence*, that is, the *Norma Judicis*; or whether he mean the *Sentence of God as Judg*, according to the *Law:* which is not the Sentence of the Law pro-

properly, but of the Judg: It's more intelligible ſpeaking, and diſtinct, that muſt edifie us, and end thoſe Controverſies which ambiguities and confuſion bred and feed.

Anſw. 6. But which-ever he meaneth, moſt certainly it is not true that the Scripture mentioneth no other Juſtification in *foro Dei.* For many of the fore-cited Texts tell us, that it oft mentioneth a Juſtification, which is no Abſolution from the Maledictory Sentence, (neither of the Law of Innocency, of *Moſes*, or of Grace) but a Juſtification of a Man's innocency in *tantum*, or *quoad Cauſam hanc particularem*, *Viz.*

1. Sometimes a Juſtifying the Righteous Man againſt the ſlanders of the World, or of his Enemies.

2. Sometimes a juſtifying a Man in ſome one action, as having dealt faithfully therein.

3. Sometimes a judging a Man to be a faithful Godly Man, that performeth the Conditions of Life in the Law of Grace made neceſſary to God's Acceptance.

4. Sometimes for making a Man ſuch, or for making him yet more inherently juſt, or continuing him ſo.

5. Sometimes for Juſtification by the Apology of an Advocate, (which is not *Abſolution*).

6. Sometimes for Juſtification by *Witneſs.*

7. And ſometimes, perhaps, by *Evidence.* As appeareth, *Iſa* 50. 8. *Rom.* 8. 33. (and ſo God himſelf is ſaid to be juſtified, *Pſal.* 51. 4. *Rom.* 3. 4. and Chriſt, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16.) 1 King. 8. 32. *Hear thou in Heaven, and do, and judg thy Servants, condemning the Wicked to bring his way upon his Head; and*

and justifying the Righteous, to give him according to his Righteousness, (where the *Sentence* is passed by the Act of Execution). Is this absolving him from the Curse of the Law? So 1 *Chron.* 6. 23. so *Mat.* 12. 37. & *Jam.* 2. 21, 24, 25. where Justification by our *Words* and by *Works* is asserted; and many other Texts so speak: Frequently to Justifie, is to *maintain* one, or *prove him* to be just. It's strange that any Divine should find but one sort or sense of Justification before God mentioned in the Scriptures.

I would give here to the Reader, a help for some excuse of the Author, *viz.* that by [*præter unam illam quæ est Absolutio*] he might mean, which is *partly Absolution*, and *partly Acceptation*, as of a fulfiller of the Precept of Perfection by Christ, and partly Right to the Reward, all three making up the whole; but that I must not teach him how to speak his own mind, or think that he knew not how to utter it; And specially, because the Instances here prove that even so it is very far from Truth, had he so spoken.

Answ. 7. But what if the word [*Justification*] had been found only as he affirmed? If *Justice*, (Righteousness) and *Just*, be otherwise used, that's all one in the sense, and almost in the word; seeing it is confessed, that *to Justifie*, is, 1. To *make Just*; 2. Or to *esteem Just*; 3. Or *sentence Just*; 4. Or to prove Just, and defend as Just; 5. Or to *use* as Just by execution. And therefore in so many senses as a Man is called *Just* in Scripture, he is inclusively, or by connotation, said to be *Justified*, and *Justifiable*, and *Justificandus*. And I desire no more of the Impartial Reader, but to

turn

turn to his *Concordances*, and peruse all the Texts where the words [Just, Justice, Justly, Righteous, Righteousness, Righteously] are used; and if he find not that they are many score, if not hundred times used, for that Righteousness which is the Persons Relation resulting from some Acts or Habits of his own, (as the Subject or Agent) and otherwise than according to his solitary sense here, let him then believe this Author.

§. 3. But he is as unhappy in his Proofs, as in his singular untrue Assertion: "[Rom. 8. 2, 4. "*The Law of the Spirit of Life, hath freed us from* "*the Law of Sin and of Death.* Gal. 3. 13. *God* "*sent his Son, that the Righteousness of the Law* "*might be fulfilled in us; Christ hath redeemed us* "*from the Curse of the Law*; and many more such: Here is no mention of any but *one Legal Justification*].

Answ. 1. Reader, do you believe that these two Texts are a perfect Enumeration. And that if these mention but one sense or sort of Justification, that it will follow that no more is mentioned in Scripture: Or if many hundred other Texts have the same sense?

2. Nay, he hath chosen only these Texts where the word [*Justification*] or [*Justifie*] is not at all found. By which I may suppose that he intendeth the Controversie here *de re*, and not *de nomine*. And is that so? Can any Man that ever considerately opened the Bible, believe that *de re* no such Thing is mentioned in Scripture. 1. As making a Man a believing Godly Man. 2. Or as performing the Conditions of Life required of us in the Covenant of Grace. 3. Nor esteeming a Man

Man such. 4. Nor defending or proving him to be such. 5. Nor judging him such decisively. 6. Nor using him as such. 7. Nor as justifying a Man so far as he is Innocent and Just against all false Accusation of Satan or the World.

3. The first Text cited by him, *Rom.* 8.24. downright contradicts him: Not only *Augustine*, but divers Protestant Expositors suppose, that by the *Law of the Spirit of Life* is meant, either the *quickning Spirit it self* given to us that are in Christ, or the Gospel, as it *giveth that Spirit into us*; And that by *delivering* us from the *Law of Sin*, is meant either from that *sin which is* as a *Law within us*, or *Moses Law*, as it forbiddeth and commandeth all its peculiarities, and so maketh *doing* or *not doing* them sin; and as it declareth sin, yea, and accidentally irritateth it: Yea, that by the Law of Death is meant, not only that Law we are cursed by, and so guilty, but chiefly that Law, as it is said *Rom.* 7. to *kill Paul*, and to occasion the abounding of sin, and the Life of it: And that by [*the fulfilling of the Law in us, that walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit*], is meant [that by the Spirit and Grace of Christ, Christians do fulfil the Law, as it requireth sincere Holiness, Sobriety and Righteousness, which God accepteth for Christ's sake; which the Law of *Moses*, without Christ's Spirit, enabled no Man to fulfil]. Not to weary the Reader with citing Expositors, I now only desire him to peruse, *Ludov. de Dieu* on the Text.

And it is certain, that the Law that *Paul* there speaketh of, was *Moses* Law: And that he is proving all along, that the observation of it was not necessary to the Gentiles, to their *performance*, or Justi-

Justification and Salvation, (*necessitate præcepti vel medii*); (for it would not justifie the Jews themselves). And sure, 1. all his meaning is not, [The Law will not absolve Men from the sense of the Law]. But also *its Works* will give no one the just title of a Righteous Man, accepted of God, and saved by him, as judging between the Righteous and the wicked: (as Christ saith, *Matth.* 25. *The Righteous shall go into Everlasting Life*, &c.) 2. And if it were only the *Maledictory Sentence* of *Moses Law*, as such, that *Paul* speaketh of Absolution from, as our only Justification, then none but Jews and Proselites who were under that Law, could have the Justification by Faith which he mentioneth; for it curseth none else: For what-ever the Law saith, it saith to them that are under the Law: The rest of the World were only under the Law of lapsed Nature, (the relicts of *Adam*'s Law of Innocency) and the Curse for *Adam*'s first Violation; and the Law of Grace made to *Adam* and *Noah*, and after perfected fullier by Christ in its second Edition.

2. His other Text [*Christ redeemed us from the Curse of the Law*] proveth indeed that all Believers are redeemed from the Curse of the first Law of Innocency, and the Jews from the Curse of *Moses Law* (which is it that is *directly* meant): But what's that to prove that these words speak the whole and the *only Justification?* and that the Scripture mentioneth no other?

§. 4. He addeth, [*Lex est quæ prohibet; Lex quæ pœnam decernit; Lex quæ irrogat: Peccatum est transgressio Legis: Pœna effectus istius trangressionis; Justificatio denique absolutio ab ista pœna: Itaque cum*

cum Lex niſi præſtita neminem Juſtificat, & præſtitam omnes in Chriſto agnoſcunt, aut Legalis erit omnis Juſtificatio coram Deo, aut omnino nulla].

Anſw. 1. But doth he know but *one ſort of Law* of God? Hath every Man incurred the Curſe by *Moſes* Law that did by *Adams*? Or every Man fallen under the peremptory irreverſible condemnation which the Law of Grace paſſeth on them that never believe and repent? Doth this Law, [*He that believeth not ſhall be damned*] damn Believers? One Law condemneth all that are not Innocent. Another ſuppoſeth them under that defect, and condemneth peremptorily (not every Sinner) but the Wicked and Unbelievers.

2. Again here he ſaith, [*Juſtification is Abſolution from that Penalty*]. But is a Man abſolved (properly) from that which he was never guilty of? Indeed if he take *Abſolution* ſo looſly as to ſignifie, the juſtifying a Man againſt a falſe Accuſation, and pronouncing him *Not-Guilty*; So all the Angels in Heaven may poſſibly be capable of Abſolution: Juſtification is ordinarily ſo uſed, but Abſolution ſeldom by Divines. And his words ſhew that this is not his ſenſe, if I underſtand them. But if we are reputed perfect fulfillers of the Law of Innocency by Chriſt, and yet Juſtification is our Abſolution from the Curſe, then no Man is juſtified that is Righteous by that Imputation.

3. And how unable is my weak Underſtanding, to make his words at peace with themſelves? The ſame Man in the next lines ſaith, [*Lex niſi præſtita neminem juſtificat:* and all *Juſtification before God muſt be legal or none*]; ſo that no Man is juſtified but as reputed Innocent, or a performer of the Law:

And

And yet *Justification* is our Absolution from the Punishment and Malediction of the Law; As if he said, No Man is justified but by the pardon of that sin which he is reputed never to have had, and Absolution from that Curse and Punishment which he is reputed never to have deserved or been under. Are these things reconcileable? But if really he take *Absolution* for justifying or acquitting from a false Accusation, and so to be absolved from the Malediction of the Law, is to be reputed one that never deserved it, or was under it, then it's as much as to say, that there is no pardon of sin, or that no Man that is pardoned, or reputed to need a Pardon, is justified.

4. All this and such Speeches would perswade the Reader that this Learned Disputer thinketh that I took and use the word [Legal] generally as of that which is related to any Law *in genere*, and so take *Evangelical* contrarily for that which is related to no Law: whereas I over and over tell him, that (speaking in the usual Language that I may be understood) I take [Legal] *specially* (and not generally) for that Righteousness which is related to the *Law of Works* or *Innocency*, (not as if we had indeed such a Righteousness as that Law will justifie us for; But a *pro-Legal-Righteousness*, one *instead of it*, *in* and *by* our perfect Saviour, which shall effectually save us from that Laws condemnation): And that by [*Evangelical Righteousness*], I mean, that which is related to the *Law of Grace*, as the Rule of *Judgment*, upon the just pleading whereof that Law will not condemn but justifie us. If he knew this to be my meaning, in my weak judgment, he should not have written either as if he did

did not, or as if he would perſwade his Rsaders to the contrary: For Truth is moſt congruouſly defended by Truth: But if he *knew it not*, I deſpair of becoming intelligible to him, by any thing that I can write, and I ſhall expect that this Reply be wholly loſt to him and worſe.

5. His [*Lex niſi præſtita neminem juſtificat*] is true; and therefore no Man is juſtified by the Law, But his next words [*& præſtitam omnes in Chriſto agnoſcunt*] ſeemeth to mean that [*It was performed by us in Chriſt*]; Or that [*It juſtifieth us, becauſe performed perfectly by Chriſt as ſuch*]: Which both are the things that we moſt confidently deny. It was not Phyſically, or Morally, or Politically, or Legally, or Reputatively, (take which word you will) *fulfilled by us in Chriſt*: it doth not juſtifie us, becauſe it was fulfilled by Chriſt, (*as ſuch*, or immediately, and *eo nomine*). It juſtified *Chriſt*, becauſe he fulfilled it; and ſo their Law doth all the perfect Angels. But we did not perſonally fulfil it in Chriſt; it never allowed *vicarium obedientiæ* to fulfil it by our *ſelves* or another: Therefore anothers *Obedience*, merely as ſuch, (even a Mediators) is not our Obedience or Juſtification: But that Obedience juſtifieth us, as given us only in or to the effecting of our Perſonal Righteouſneſs, which conſiſteth in our right to Impunity, and to God's Favour and Life, freely given for Chriſt's Merits ſake, and in our performance of the Conditions of the Law of Grace, or that free Gift, which is therefore not a co-ordinate but a ſub-ordinate Righteouſneſs (and Juſtification) to qualifie us for the former. This is ſo plain and neceſſary, that if (in ſenſe) it be not underſtood by all that are admitted to the Sa-

cramental Communion, (excepting Verbal Controversies or Difficulties) I doubt we are too lax in our admissions.

§. 5. Next he tells us of a *threefold respect of Justification*: 1. *Ex parte principii.* 2. *Termini.* 3. *Medii*: (I find my self uncapeable of *teaching him*, that is a Teacher of such as I; and therefore presume not to tell him how to distinguish more congruously, plainly, and properly, as to the terms). And *as to the Principle or Fountain whence it floweth*, that is, *Evangelical Grace in Christ*, he saith, *It is thus necessary, that in our lapsed State all Justification be Evangelical*].

Answ. Who would desire a *sharper* or a *softer*, a more *dissenting* or a more *consenting* Adversary? Very good: If then I mean it *ex parte principii*, I offend him not by asserting Evangelical Righteousness: The Controversie then will be only *de nomine*, whether it be congruous thus to call it. And really are his *Names* and *Words* put into our Creed, and become so necessary as to be worthy of all the stress that he layeth on them, and the calling up the Christian World to arrive by their Zeal against our Phrase? Must the Church be awakened to rise up against all those that will say with Christ, [*By thy words thou shalt be justified*]. And with *James*, [*By Works a Man is justified, and not by Faith only*], and [*we are judged by the Law of Liberty*]; and as Christ, *Joh.* 5. 22. [*The Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son*]; and that shall recite the 25*th* Chapter of *Matthew*.

Even now he said at once, [*There is no Justification* in foro Dei, *but Absolution*, &c. *The Law of the Spirit of Life hath freed us*, &c. *Here is no* men-

mention of any Juſtification but Legal]. And now [*All our Juſtification* ex parte principii, is *only Evangelical*]. So then *no Text* talks of *Evangelical Juſtification*, or of Juſtification *ex parte principii*: And *Abſolution* which defineth it, is named *ex parte principii*. And yet all *Juſtification* is *Evangelical*. Is this mode of Teaching worthy a Defence by a Theological War?

2. But Reader, Why may not I denominate Juſtification *ex parte principii? Righteouſneſs* is formally a Relation: To juſtifie conſtitutively, is to *make Righteous*. To be Juſtified, (or Juſtification *in ſenſu paſſivo*) is to be made *Righteous*; And *in foro*, to be *judged Righteous*: And what meaneth he by *Principium* as to a Relation, but that which other Men call the *Fundamentum*, which is *loco Efficientis*, or a remote efficient? And whence can a Relation be more fitly named, than from the *fundamentum*, whence it hath its formal being? Reader, bear with my Error, or correct it, if I miſtake. I think that as our *Righteouſneſs* is not all of one ſort, no more is the *fundamentum*: 1. I think I have no Righteouſneſs, whoſe immediate *fundamentum* is my ſinleſs Innocency, or fulfilling the Law of Works or Innocency, by my ſelf or another: and ſo I have no *fundamentum* of ſuch. 2. I hope I have a Righteouſneſs conſiſting in my perſonal *Right* to *Impunity* and *Life*; and that *Jus* or *Right* is mine by the *Title* of *free Condonation* and *Donation* by the Goſpel-Covenant or Grant: And ſo that Grant or Goſpel is the *fundamentum* of it: But the Merits of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs purchaſed that Gift, and ſo thoſe Merits are the remote *fundamentum* or efficient: And thus my Juſtification,

by the Doctor's confeſſion, is Evangelical. 3. I muſt periſh if I have not alſo a ſubordinate perſonal Righteouſneſs, conſiſting in my performance of thoſe Conditions on which the New-Covenant giveth the former. And the *fundamentum* of this Righteouſneſs is the Reality of that performance, as related to the Irrogation, Impoſition, or Tenor of the Covenant, making this the Condition. This is my Hereſie, if I be heretical; and be it right or wrong, I will make it intelligible, and not by ſaying and unſaying, involve all in confuſion.

§. 6. He addeth, [*Ex parte Termini Legalis eſt, quia terminatur in ſatisfactione, Legi præſtandâ: Liberavit me à Lege mortis, &c. And hence,* he ſaith, *the denomination is properly taken.*

Anſw: 1. The Reader here ſeeth that all this Zeal is exerciſed in a *Game at Words*, or *Logical Notions*; and the Church muſt be called for the umpirage, to ſtand by in Arms to judg that he hath won the Day: What if the *denomination be properly to be taken from* the *Terminus?* Is it as dangerous as you frightfully pretend to take it *aliunde?* 2. But ſtay a little: Before we come to this, we muſt crave help to underſtand what he talketh of: Is it, 1. *Juſtificatio, Juſtificans (active ſumpta)*? Or, 2. *Juſtificatio Juſtificati (paſſive)*? 3. Or *Juſtitia?*

1. The firſt is *Actio*, and the *Terminus* of that Action is two-fold. 1. The Object or Patient (a believing Sinner). 2. The Effect, *Juſtificatio paſſivè*, neither of theſe is *the Law*, or its *Maledictio*n. But which of theſe is it that we muſt needs name it from?

2. The *paſſive* or *effective* Juſtification is in reſpect of the Subjects Reception called *Paſſio:* In reſpect

reſpect of the form received, it is as various as I before mentioned.

1. The Effect of the Donative Juſtification of the Law of Grace, is *Juſtitia data*; a Relation (oft deſcribed).

2. The Effect of the Spirits giving us *Inherent Righteouſneſs*, is a *Quality given*, *Acts excited*, and a Relation thence reſulting.

3. The Effect of *Juſtification per ſententiam Judicis*, is immediately a Relation, *Jus Judicatum*.

4. The Effect of an Advocates Juſtification, is *Juſtitia & perſona ut defenſa ſeu vindicata*.

5. The Effect of *Executive Juſtification*, is Actual Impunity or Liberation. And are all theſe one *Terminus*, or hence one name then? Theſe are the *Termini* of *Juſtificatio Juſtificantis*, *ut Actionis*; and nothing of this nature can be plainer, than that, 1. Remiſſion of ſin (paſſively taken) the *Reatus* or *Obligatio ad pœnam*, (the firſt *ad quem*, and the ſecond *à quo*) are both the immediate *Termini* of our Act of Juſtification. 2. That the *Terminus Juſtitiæ*, as it is the formal Relation of a Juſtified Perſon, as ſuch, is the Law as *Norma Actionum*, as to Righteous Actions, and the Law or Covenant, as making the Condition of Life, as to thoſe Actions, *ſub ratione Conditionis & Tituli*. And the Promiſſory and Minatory part of the Law, as *Juſtitia* is *Jus præmii*, *& impunitatis*. Firſt, The Actions, and then the Perſon are Juſt in Relation to the Law or Covenant, by which their Actions and they are to be judged. But the remoter *Terminus* is the *malum à quo*, and the *bonum ad quod*. And as *à quo*, it is not only the *evil* denounced, but alſo the

Reatus, or Obligation to it, and the efficacious Act of the Law thus curſing, and the *Accuſation* of the Actor or Accuſer, (real or poſſible) that is ſuch a *terminus*.

II. But when he ſaith, *Ex parte Termini Legalis eſt*, either ſtill he taketh *legal generally*, as comprehending the Law of *Innocency*, of *Works*, and of *Grace*, or not. If he do, I muſt hope he is more *intelligent* and *juſt*, than to inſinuate to his Reader, that I ever mention an *Evangelical Juſtification* that is not ſo legal, as to be denominated from the Law of Grace, as diſtinct from that of Works: If not, he was indebted to his intelligent Reader for ſome proof, that no Man is juſtified againſt this falſe Accuſation; [Thou art by the Law of Grace the Heir of a far ſorer puniſhment, for deſpiſing the Remedy, and not performing the Conditions of Pardon and Life. And alſo for this thou haſt no right to Chriſt, and the Gifts of his Covenant of Grace]. But no ſuch proof is found in his Writings, nor can be given.

III. But his [*Quia Terminatur in ſatisfactione Legi præſtanda*]. I confeſs it is a Sentence not very intelligible or edifying to me. 1. *Satisfactio proprie & ſtricte ſic dicta differt à ſolutione ejuſdem quod ſit, ſolutio æquivalentis aliæ indebitæ:* Which of theſe he meaneth, Satisfaction thus ſtrictly taken, or *ſolutio ejuſdem*, I know not: Nor know what it is that he meaneth by *Legi præſtandâ:* Indeed *ſolutio ejuſdem* is *Legi præſtandæ*, but not *præſtita* by us (perſonally or by another): For we neither kept the Law, nor bare the full Penalty; And the

the Law mentioned no *Vicarium Obedientiæ aut pœnæ*; Christ *performed the Law*, as it obliged himself as Mediator, and as a Subject, but not as *it obliged us*; for it obliged us to *Personal performance only*: And Christ by bearing that Punishment (in some respects) which we deserved, satisfied the *Law-giver*, (who had power to take a Commutation) but not *the Law*: unless speaking improperly you will say that the *Law is satisfied*, when the remote ends of the Law-giver and Law are obtained. For the Law hath but one fixed sense, and may be it self changed, but changeth not it self, nor accepteth a *tantundem*: And Christ's suffering for us, was a *fulfilling* of the Law, which peculiarly *bound him* to suffer, and not a Satisfaction *loco solutionis ejusdem*: And it was no *fulfilling* the *Penal part* of the *Law* as it bound *us* to suffer: For so it bound none but us; so that the *Law* as *binding* us to *Duty* or *Suffering*, was neither *fulfilled*, nor strictly *satisfied* by Christ; but the *Law-giver* satisfied, and the remote ends of the Law attained, by Christ's perfect fulfilling all that Law which bound himself as Mediator.

Now whether he mean the Law as binding us to *Duty*, or to *Punishment*, or both, and what by *satisfaction* I am not sure: But as far as I can make sense of it, it seemeth to mean, that *Pœna* is *satisfactio loco obedientiæ*, and that Punishment being our Due, this was *satisfactio Legi præstandâ*, (for he saith not *Præstita*). But then he must judge that we are justified only from the *penal Obligation* of the Law, and not from the *preceptive Obligation* to perfect Obedience. And this will not stand with the scope of other Passages, where he endureth not

my Opinion, that we are not *justified* by the *fac hoc*, the Precept as fulfilled, or from the *Reatus Culpæ in se*, but by Christ's whole Righteousness from the *Reatus ut ad pœnam*.

2. But if this be his sense, he meaneth then that it is only the *Terminus à quo*, that *Justification* is properly denominated from. And why so? 1. As *Justitia* and *Justificatio passive sumpta, vel ut effectus*, is *Relatio*, it hath necessarily no *Terminus à quo*; And certainly is *in specie*, to be rather denominated from its own proper *Terminus ad quem*. And as *Justification* is taken for the Justifiers *Action*, why is it not as well to be denominated from the *Terminus ad quem*, as *à quo*? *Justificatio efficiens sic dicitur, quia Justum facit: Justificatio apologetica, quia Justum vindicat vel probat. Justificatio per sententiam, quia Justum aliquem esse Judicat: Justificatio executiva, quia ut Justum eum tractat.*

But if we must needs denominate from the *Terminus à quo*, how strange is it that he should know but of *one* sense of *Justification*?

3. But yet perhaps he meaneth, [*In satisfactione Legi præstitâ*, though he say *præstandâ*, and so denominateth from the *Terminus à quo*: But if so, 1. Then it cannot be true: For *satisfacere & Justificare* are not the same thing, nor is *Justifying giving Satisfaction*; nor were we justified when Christ had satisfied, but long after: Nor are we justified *eo nomine*, because Christ satisfied, (that is, immediately) but because he gave us that *Jus ad impunitatem & vitam & spiritum sanctum*, which is the *Fruit* of his Satisfaction. 2. And as is said, if it be only *in satisfactione*, then it is not in that *Obedience which fulfileth* the preceptive part as it bound

bound us: for to ſatisfie for not fulfilling, is not to fulfil it. 3. And then no Man is juſtified, for no Man hath ſatisfied either the Preceptive or Penal Obligation of the Law, by himſelf or another: But Chriſt hath ſatisfied the Law-giver by Merit and Sacrifice for ſin.

His *Liberavit nos à Lege Mortis*, I before ſhewed impertinent to his uſe, Is *Liberare & Juſtificare*, or *Satisfacere* all one? And is *à Lege Mortis*, either from all the Obligation to Obedience, or from the ſole malediction? There be other Acts of *Liberation* beſides *Satisfaction*: For it is [*The Law of the Spirit of Life*] that doth it: And we are freed both from the *power* of *indwelling-ſin*, (called a Law) and from the Moſaical Yoak, and from the Impoſſible Conditions of the Law of Innocency, though not from its bare Obligation to future Duty.

§. 7. He addeth a Third, *Ex parte Medii, quod eſt Juſtitia Chriſti Legalis nobis per fidem Imputata: Omnem itaque Juſtificationem proprie Legalem eſſe conſtat.*

Anſw. 1. When I read that he will have but one ſenſe or ſort of Juſtification, will yet have the Denomination to be *ex termino*, and ſo juſtifieth my diſtinction of it, according to the various *Termini*; And here how he maketh the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to be but the *MEDIUM* of our Juſtification, (though he ſhould have told us which ſort of *Medium* he meaneth) he ſeemeth to me a very favourable conſenting Adverſary: And I doubt thoſe Divines who maintain that Chriſt's Rigteouſneſs is the *Cauſa Formalis* of our Juſtification, (who are no ſmall ones, nor a few, though other in anſwer to the Papiſts diſclaim it) yea, and thoſe that make it

but

but *Cauſa Materialis*, (which may have a ſound ſenſe) will think this Learned Man betrayeth their Cauſe by prevarication, and ſeemeth to ſet fiercly againſt me, that he may yeeld up the Cauſe with leſs ſuſpicion. But the truth is, we all know but in part, and therefore err in part, and Error is inconſiſtent with it ſelf. And as we have conflicting Fleſh and Spirit in the *Will*, ſo have we conflicting *Light* and *Darkneſs*, *Spirit* and *Fleſh* in the Underſtanding; And it is very perceptible throughout this Author's Book, that in one line the *Fleſh* and *Darkneſs* ſaith one thing, and in the next oft the *Spirit* and *Light* ſaith the contrary, and ſeeth not the inconſiſtency: And ſo though the *dark* and *fleſhy* part riſe up in wrathful ſtriving Zeal againſt the Concord and Peace of Chriſtians, on pretence that other Mens Errors wrong the Truth, yet I doubt not but Love and Unity have ſome intereſt in his lucid and Spiritual part. We do not only grant him that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is a *Medium* of our Juſtification, (for ſo alſo is *Faith* a *Conditio*, and *Diſpoſitio Receptiva* being a *Medium*); nor only ſome *Cauſe*, (for ſo alſo is the *Covenant-Donation*); but that it is an *efficient meritorious Cauſe*, and becauſe if Righteouſneſs had been that of our own, *Innocency* would have been founded in *Merit*, we may call Chriſt's Righteouſneſs the *material Cauſe* of our Juſtification, remotely, as it is *Materia Meriti*, the Matter of the *Merit* which procureth it.

2. But for all this it followeth not that all Juſtification is only *Legal*, as *Legal* noteth its reſpect to the Law of Innocency: For 1. we are juſtified from or againſt the Accuſation of being non-performers of the Condition of the Law of Grace; 2. And

2. And of being therefore unpardoned, and lyable to its forer Penalty. 3. Our particular ſubordinate Perſonal Righteouſneſs conſiſting in the ſaid performance of thoſe Evangelical Conditions of Life, is ſo denominated from its conformity to the Law of Grace, (as it inſtituteth its own Condition) as the meaſure of it, (as *Rectitudo ad Regulam*). 4. Our *Jus ad impunitatem & vitam*, reſulteth from the *Donative* Act of the Law or Covenant of Grace, as the *Titulus qui eſt Fundamentum Juris*, or ſuppoſition of our Faith as the Condition. 5. This Law of Grace is the *Norma Judicii*, by which we ſhall be judged at the Laſt Day. 6. The ſame Judg doth now *per ſententiam conceptam* judg of us, as he will then judg *per ſententiam prolatam*. 7. Therefore the Sentence being *virtually* in the Law, this ſame Law of Grace, which in *primo inſtanti* doth make *us Righteous*, (by *Condonation* and *Donation* of Right) doth *in ſecundo inſtanti*, *virtually* juſtifie us as containing that regulating uſe, by which we are to be ſententially juſtified. And now judg Reader, whether no Juſtification be Evangelical, or by the Law of Grace, and ſo to be denominated: (for it is *lis de nomine* that is by him managed). 8. Beſides that the whole frame of Cauſes in the Work of Redemption, (the Redeemer, his Righteouſneſs, Merits, Sacrifice, Pardoning Act, Interceſſion, *&c.*) are ſure rather to be called Matters of the Goſpel, than of the Law.

And yet we grant him eaſily; 1. That Chriſt perfectly fulfilled the Law of Innocency, and was juſtified thereby, and that we are juſtified by that Righteouſneſs of his, as the meritorious Cauſe.

2. That

2. That we being guilty of Sin and Death, according to the tenor of that Law, and that Guilt being remitted by Christ, as aforesaid, we are therefore justified from that Law, (that is, from its Obligation of us to Innocency as the necessary terms of Life, and from its Obligation of us to Death, for want of Innocency): But we are not justified by that Law, either as fulfilled or as satisfied by *us our selves*, either personally or by an Instrument, substitute or proper Representative, that was *Vicarius Obedientiæ aut pœnæ*. 3. And we grant that the Jews were delivered from the positive Jewish Law, which is it that *Paul* calleth, *The Law of Works*. And if he please, in all these respects to call *Justification Legal*, we intend not to quarrel with the name, (though what I called *Legal* in those *Aphorisms*, I chose ever after to call rather, *Justitia pro-legalis*). But we cannot believe him, 1. That it is *only Legal*; 2. Or that that is the *only* (or most) proper denomination.

§. 8. He proceedeth thus, [*And it will be vain, if any argue, That yet none can be saved without Evangelical Works, according to which it is confessed that all men shall be judged: for the distinction is easie (which the Author of the Aphorisms somewhere useth) between the first or Private, and the last or Publick Justification. —— In the first sense it is never said, That Works justifie, but contrary, That God justifieth him that worketh not*, Rom. 4. 5. *In the latter we confess that Believers are to be justified according to Works, but yet not Of (or By) Works, nor that that Justification maketh men just before God, but only so pronounceth them.*

Answ. 1. This is such another *Consenting Adversary*

verſary as once before I was put to anſwer; who with open mouth calls himſelf conſequentially what he calleth me; if the ſame *Cauſe*, and not the *Perſon* make the Guilt. Nay let him conſider whether his *grand* and moſt *formidable Weapon* [*So alſo ſaith* Bellarmine, *with other Papiſts*] do not wound himſelf: For *they* commonly ſay, That *the firſt Juſtification* is not of *Works*, or *Works* do not firſt juſtifie us. Have I not now proved that he *erreth and complyeth with the Papiſts?* If not, let him uſe better Arguments himſelf.

2. But why is the firſt *Juſtification* called *Private?* Either he meaneth God's *making us juſt conſtitutively*, or his *judging* us ſo: and that *per ſententiam conceptam* only, or *prolatam* alſo.

1. The common diſtinction in Politicks, *inter judicium Privatum & Publicum*, is fetcht from the *Judg*, who is either *Perſona privata vel publica*: a *private* Man, or an *authorized Judg* judging as ſuch: And ſo the Judgment of Conſcience, Friends, Enemies, Neighbours, mere Arbitrators, *&c.* is *Judicium privatum*; and that of a *Judg in foro*, is *Judicium publicum*, (yea, or in ſecret, before the concerned Parties only in his Cloſet, ſo it be deciſive): If this Learned Doctor ſo underſtand it, then, 1. *Conſtitutive Juſtification* (which is truly firſt) is publick Juſtification, being done by God the Father, and by our Redeemer, who ſure are not herein *private* authorized *Perſons*. 2. And the firſt *ſentential Juſtification*, as merely *Virtual*, and not yet *Actual*, viz. as it's virtually in the Juſtifying Law of Grace as *norma Judicii* is *publick in ſuo genere*, being the *virtus* of a Publick Law of God, or of his Donative Promiſe. 3. And the

firſt

first *Actual Justification, per Deum Judicem per sententiam conceptam* (which is God's secret judging the Thing and Person to be as they are) is (secret indeed *in se*, yet revealed by God's publick Word but) publick as to the Judg. 4. And the first *sententia prolata* (the fourth in order) is someway publick as opposite to secresie, (for, 1. it is before the Angels of Heaven; 2. And in part by Executive demonstrations on Earth): But it is certainly by a *publick Judg*, that is, God. 5. And the first *Apologetical Justification* by Christ our *Interceding Advocate*, is publick both *quoad personam*, and as *openly* done in Heaven: And if this worthy Person deny any Justification *per sententiam Judicis*, upon our first Believing, or before the final Judgment, he would wofully fall out with the far greatest number of Protestants, and especially his closest Friends, who use to make *a Sentence* of *God* as Judg to be the *Genus* to Justification.

But if by [*Private* and *Publick Justification*]; he means [*secret* and *open*]. 1. How can he hope to be understood when he will use Political Terms unexplained, out of the usual sense of Politicians: But no men use to *abuse words* more than they that would keep the Church in flames by *wordy Controversies*, as if they were of the terms of Life and Death. 2. And even in that sense our first Justification is *publick* or open, *quoad Actum Justificantis*, as being by the Donation of a publick Word of God; Though *quoad effectum in recipiente*, it must needs be secret till the Day of Judgment, no Man knowing anothers Heart, whether he be indeed a sound Believer: And so of the rest as is intimated.

Con-

Concerning what I have said before, some may Object, 1. *That there is no such thing as our Justification notified before the Angels in Heaven.* 2. *That the* Sententia Concepta *is God's Immanent Acts, and therefore Eternal.*

Answ. To the first, I say, 1. It is certain by *Luk.* 15. 10. that the Angels know of the Conversion of a Sinner, and therefore of his Justification and publickly Rejoyce therein. Therefore it is notified to them. 2. But I refer the Reader for this, to what I have said to Mr. *Tombes* in my *Disputation of Justification*, where I do give my thoughts, That this is not the Justification by Faith meant by *Paul*, as Mr. *Tombes* asserteth it to be.

To the Second, I say, Too many have abused Theology, by the misconceiving of the distinction of *Immanent* and *Transient Acts* of God, taking all for *Immanent* which effect nothing *ad extra*. But none are properly *Immanent quoad Objectum*, but such as God himself is the *Object* of, (as *se intelligere, se amare*): An Act may be called indeed immanent in any of these three respects; 1. *Ex parte Agentis*; 2. *Ex parte Objecti*; 3. *Ex parte effectus*. 1. Ex *parte agentis*, all God's Acts are *Immanent*, for they are his Essence. 2. *Ex parte Objecti vel Termini*, God's Judging a Man Just or Unjust, Good or Bad, is transient; because it is denominated from the state of the *Terminus* or Object: And so it may be *various* and *mutable* denominatively, notwithstanding God's *Simplicity* and *Immutability*. And so the *Sententia Concepta* is not *ab Æterno*. 3. As to the *Effect*, all confess God's Acts to be Transient and Temporary. But there are some that *effect* not (as to judg a thing to be what it is).

3. Either

3. Either this Militant Disputer would have his Reader believe that I say, That a *Man is justified by Works*, in that which he called [*making just*, and the *first Justification*], or not: If he would, such *untruth* and *unrighteousness* (contrary to the full drift of many of my Books, and even that which he selected to oppose) is not a congruous way of disputing for *Truth* and *Righteousness*: nor indeed is it tolerably ingenuous or modest. If not, then why doth he all along carry his professed agreement with me, in a militant strain, perswading his Reader, that I savour of Socinianism or Popery, or some dangerous Error, by saying the very same that he saith. O what thanks doth God's Church owe such contentious Disputers for supposed Orthodoxness, that like *noctambuli*, will rise in their sleep, and cry, Fire, Fire, or beat an Allarm on their Drums, and cry out, *The Enemy, The Enemy*, and will not let their Neighbours rest!

I have wearied my Readers with so oft repeating in my Writings (upon such repeated importunities of others) these following Assertions about Works.

1. That we are never justified, first or last, by Works of *Innocency*.

2. Nor by the *Works* of the Jewish Law (which *Paul* pleadeth against).

3. Nor by any Works of Merit, in point of Commutative Justice, or of *distributive* Governing Justice, according to either of those Laws (of *Innocency*, or *Jewish*).

4. Nor by any Works or Acts of Man, which are set against or instead of the least part of God's Acts,

Acts, Christ's Merits, or any of his part or honour.

5. Nor are we at first justified by any *Evangelical Works of Love, Gratitude or Obedience to Christ*, as *Works* are distinguished from our first *Faith* and *Repentance*.

6. Nor are we justified by *Repentance*, as by an *instrumental* efficient Cause, or as of the same receiving Nature with Faith, except as *Repentance* signifieth our change from *Unbelief* to *Faith*, and so is *Faith* it self.

7. Nor are we justified by *Faith* as by a mere Act, or moral good Work.

8. Nor yet as by a proper efficient Instrument of our Justification.

9. Much less by such *Works* of Charity to Men, as are without true love to God.

10. And least of all, by Popish bad Works, called *Good*, (as Pilgrimages, hurtful Austerities, &c.)

But if any Church-troubling Men will first call *all Acts* of Man's Soul by the name of WORKS, and next will call no Act by the name of *Justifying Faith*, but the *belief of the Promise* (as some) or the *accepting* of *Christ's Righteousness given* or *imputed to us*, as *in se*, our own (as others) or [the *Recumbency on this Righteousness*] (as others) or all these three *Acts* (as others); and if next they will say that this *Faith justifieth* us only as the proper *Instrumental Cause*; and next that to look for Justification by any other Act of Man's Soul, or by this Faith in any other respect, is to trust to that Justification by *Works*, which *Paul* confuteth, and to fall from Grace, I do detest such corrupting and

abuſing of the Scriptures, and the Church of Chriſt. And I aſſert as followeth;

1. That the Faith which we are juſtified by, doth as eſſentially contain our belief of the Truth of Chriſt's Perſon, Office, Death, Reſurrection, Interceſſion, *&c.* as of the Promiſe of Imputation.

2. And alſo our conſent to Chriſt's Teaching, Government, Interceſſion, as to Imputation.

3. And our *Acceptance* of Pardon, Spirit, and promiſed Glory, as well as Imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

4. Yea, that it is eſſentially a Faith in God the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt.

5. That it hath in it eſſentially ſomewhat of Initial Love to God, to Chriſt, to Recovery, to Glory; that is, of Volition; and ſo of Deſire.

6. That it containeth all that Faith, which is neceſſarily requiſite at Baptiſm to that Covenant; even a *conſenting-practical-belief* in God the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*: and *is* our Chriſtianity it ſelf.

7. That we are juſtified by this *Faith*, as it is [*A moral Act of Man, adapted to its proper Office, made by our Redeemer, the Condition of his Gift of Juſtification, and ſo is the moral receptive aptitude of the Subject*, or the *Diſpoſitio materiæ vel ſubjecti Recipientis*]: Where the Matter of it is [*An adapted moral Act of Man*] (by Grace). The *Ratio formalis* of its Intereſt in our Juſtification is [*Conditio præſtita*] ſpeaking *politically*, and [*Aptitudo vel Diſpoſitio moralis Receptiva*] ſpeaking logically; which Dr. *Twiſs* ſtill calleth *Cauſa diſpoſitiva*.

8. That Repentance as it is a change of the Mind from Unbelief to Faith, (in God the Father, Son,

Son, and Holy Ghoſt) is this Faith denominated from its *Terminus à quo* (principally).

9. That we are continually juſtified by this Faith as continued, as well as initially juſtified by its firſt Act.

10. That as this *Faith* includeth a *conſent* to *future Obedience*, (that is, Subjection) ſo the *performance* of that *conſent* in *ſincere Obedience*, is the Condition of our Juſtification as continued (Secondarily) as well as Faith (or conſent it ſelf) primarily: And that thus *James* meaneth, that we are Juſtified by Works.

11. That God judging of all things truly as they are, now judgeth Men juſt or unjuſt, on theſe Terms.

12. And his Law being *Norma judicii*, now *vertually* judgeth us juſt on theſe terms.

13. And that the Law of Grace being that which we are to be judged by, we ſhall at the laſt Judgment alſo be judged (and ſo juſtified) thus far by or according to our ſincere Love, Obedience, or Evangelical Works, as the Condition of the Law or Covenant of free Grace, which juſtifieth and glorifieth freely all that are thus Evangelically qualified, by and for the Merits, perfect Righteouſneſs and Sacrifice of Chriſt, which procured the Covenant or free Gift of Univerſal Conditional Juſtification and Adoption, before and without any Works or Conditions done by Man whatſoever.

Reader, Forgive me this troubleſom oft repeating the ſtate of the Controverſie; I meddle with no other. If this be Juſtification by Works, I am for it. If this Doctor be againſt it, he is againſt much

of the Gospel. If he be not, he had better have kept his Bed, than to have call'd us to Arms in his Dream, when we have sadly warred so many Ages already about mere words. For my part, I think that such a short explication of our sense, and rejection of ambiguities, is fitter to end these quarrels, than the long disputations of Confounders.

4. But when he saith, [*Works make not a Man just, and yet we are at last justified according to them*], it is a contradiction, or unsound. For if he mean *Works* in the sence excluded by *Paul*, we are not justified *according to them, viz.* such as make, or are thought to make the *Reward to be not of Grace*, but *of Debt*: But if he take *Works* in the sense intended by *James, sincere Obedience* is a *secondary constitutive part* of that *inherent or adherent personal Righteousness, required by the Law of Grace, in subordination to Christ's Meritorious Righteousness*; And what Christian can deny this? So far it *maketh* us *Righteous*, (as *Faith* doth *initially*). And what is it to be *justified according to our Works*, but to be judged, so far as they are sincerely done, to be such as have performed the secondary part of the Conditions of free-given Life?

5. His [*According*] but not [*ex operibus*] at the Last Judgment, is but a Logomachie [*According*] signifieth as much as I assert: But [*ex*] is no unapt Preposition, when it is but the subordinate part of Righteousness and Justification, of which we speak, and signifieth (with me) the same as [*According*].

6. His Tropical Phrase, that [*Works pronounce us just*] is another ambiguity: That the Judg will

will *pronounce us juſt according to them, as the foreſaid ſecond part of the Conſtitutive Cauſe*, or *Matter* of our *Subordinate Righteouſneſs*, is certain from *Matth.* 25. and the ſcope of Scripture: But that they are only *notifying Signs*, and no part of the *Cauſe* of the day to be tryed, is not true, (which too many aſſert).

§. 9. He proceedeth, [*If there be an Evangelical Juſtification at God's Bar, diſtinct from the legal one, there will then alſo be in each an abſolution of divers ſins: For if the Goſpel forgive the ſame ſins as the Law, the ſame thing will be done, and a double Juſtification will be unprofitable and idle. If from divers ſins, then the Law forbids not the ſame things as the Goſpel*, &c.]

Anſw. It's pitty ſuch things ſhould need any Anſwer.

1. It's a falſe Suppoſition, That *all Juſtification* is *Abſolution from ſin*: To juſtifie the ſincerity of our *Faith* and *Holineſs*, is one act or part of our Juſtification, againſt all (poſſible or actual) falſe Accuſation.

2. The Law of Innocency commanded not the Believing Acceptance of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs and Pardon, and ſo the Remnants of that Law in the hand of Chriſt (which is the Precept of perfect Obedience *de futuro*) commandeth it only conſequently, ſuppoſing the Goſpel-Promiſe and Inſtitution to have gone before, and ſelected this as the terms of Life; ſo that as a *Law* in *genere* (exiſtent only *in ſpeciebus*) commandeth Obedience, and the Law of Innocency *in ſpecie* commanded [*perſonal perfect*

perfect perpetual Obedience, as the Condition of Life]; so the Gospel commandeth *Faith* in our *Redeemer*, as the new Condition of Life: on which supposition, even the Law of lapsed Nature further obligeth us thereto: And as the Commands differ, so do the Prohibitions.

There is a certain sort of sin excepted from pardon, by the pardoning Law, *viz.* Final non-performance of its Conditions: And to judg a Man not guilty of this sin, is part of our Justification, as is aforesaid.

§. 10. He addeth, [*If Legal and Evangelical Justification are specie distinct, then so are the Courts in which we are justified. — If distinct and subordinate, and so he that is justified by the Law, is justified by the Gospel*, &c.]

Answ. 1. No Man is justified by the Law of Innocency or Works, but Christ: Did I ever say that, [*That Law justifieth us*], who have voluminously wrote against it? If he would have his Reader think so, his unrighteousness is such as civility forbids me to give its proper Epithets to. If not, against what or whom is all this arguing?

2. I call it [Legal] as it is that perfect Righteousness of Christ our Surety, conform to the Law of Innocency; by which he was justified (though not absolved and pardoned): I call it [*pro Legalis justitia*], because that Law doth not justifie us for it (but Christ only) but by it given us *ad effecta* by the New-Covenant; we are saved and justified from the Curse of that Law, or from Damnation, as certainly as if we had done it our selves: I call Faith

Faith our Evangelical Righteouſneſs, on the Reaſons too oft mentioned. Now theſe may be called *Two Juſtifications*, or (rather) *two parts of one*, in ſeveral reſpects, as pleaſeth the Speaker. And all ſuch Word-Souldiers ſhall have their liberty without my Contradiction.

3. And when will he prove that theſe two Sorts, or Parts, or Acts, may not be at once tranſacted at the ſame Bar? Muſt there needs be *one Court* to try *whether I am a true Believer*, or an *Infidel*, or *Hypocrite*; and *another* to judg that *being ſuch*, I am to be juſtified againſt all Guilt and Curſe, by vertue of Chriſt's Merits and Interceſſion? Why may not theſe two parts of *one Man's Cauſe* be judged at the ſame Bar? And why muſt your Pupils be taught ſo to conceive of ſo great a buſineſs, in it ſelf ſo plain?

§. 11. He proceedeth, [*The Uſe of this Evangelical Juſtification is made to be, that we may be made partakers of the Legal Juſtification out of us, in Chriſt: And ſo our Juſtification applyeth another Juſtification, and our Remiſſion of ſins another.*

Anſw. No Sir; but our *particular ſubordinate ſort of Righteouſneſs*, conſiſting in the performance of the Conditions of the free Gift, (*viz.* a believing ſuitable *Acceptance*) is really our *Diſpoſitio receptiva*, being the Condition of our Title to that *Pardon* and *Glory*, which for Chriſt's Righteouſneſs if freely given us. And our *perſonal Faith and Sincerity* muſt be juſtified, and we *in tantum*, before our Right to Chriſt, Pardon and Life can be juſtified *in foro*.

2. And to justifie us as sincere Believers, when others are condemned as Hypocrites, and Unbelievers, and Impenitent, is not Pardon of Sin. These Matters should have been put into your (excellent) Catechism, and not made strange, much less obscured and opposed, when laying by the quarrels about mere words, I am confident you deny none of this.

§. 12. He addeth, [*Then Legal Justification is nothing but a bare word, seeing unapplyed; as to the Matter it is nothing, as it is not called Healing by a Medicine not applyed; nor was it ever heard that one Healing did apply another*].

Answ. Alas, alas, for the poor Church, if this be the Academies best! sorrow must excuse my Complaint! If it be an Argument it must run thus: If *Legal* (or *pro-legal*) *Righteousness* (that is, our part in Christ's Righteousness) be none to us (or none of our Justification) when not-applyed, than it is none also when it is applyed: But, *&c.*

Answ. It is none till applyed: Christ's Merits, or Legal Righteousness justifie himself, but not us till applyed: (Do you think otherwise, or do you wrangle against your self?) But I deny your Consequence: How prove you that it is *none when applyed therefore?* Or the Cure is none when the Medicine is applyed?

Perhaps you'l say, That *then* our *Personal Righteousness*, and *subordinate Justification*, is ours before Christ's Righteousness, and so the greater dependeth on, and followeth the less.

Answ. 1.

Anſw. 1. Chriſt's own Righteouſneſs is before ours. 2. His Condition, Pardon to fallen Mankind is before ours. 3. This Gift being Conditional, excepteth the non-performance of the Condition; And the nature of a Condition, is to *ſuſpend the effect of the Donation* till *performed*. 4. Therefore the performance goeth before the ſaid Effect, and our Title. 5. But it is not therefore any *cauſe* of it, but a *removal* of the *ſuſpenſion*; nor hath the Donation any other dependance on it. And is not all this beyond denial with Perſons not ſtudiouſly and learnedly miſled?

But you ſay, *It was never heard that one Healing applyed another.*

Anſw. And ſee you not that this is a *lis de nomine*, and of a name of your own introduction for illuſtration? If we were playing at a Game of Tropes, I could tell you that the *Healing* of Mens *Unbelief* is applicatory for the *healing* of their *Guilt*; And the healing of Men's Ignorance, Pride, and Wrangling about words, and frightning Men into a Conceit that it is about Life and Death, is applicatory as to the healing of the Churches Wounds and Shame. But I rather chuſe to ask you, Whether it was never heard that a *particular ſubordinate perſonal Righteouſneſs* (even *Faith* and *Repentance*) was made by God the Condition of our Right to Pardon, and Life by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs? Did you never teach your Sholars this, (in what words you thought beſt?) And yet even our Faith is a Fruit of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; but nevertheleſs the Condition of other Fruits.

If you ſay that our *Faith* or *Performance* is not to

2. And to justifie us as sincere Believers, when others are condemned as Hypocrites, and Unbelievers, and Impenitent, is not Pardon of Sin. These Matters should have been put into your (excellent) Catechism, and not made strange, much less obscured and opposed, when laying by the quarrels about mere words, I am confident you deny none of this.

§. 12. He addeth, [*Then Legal Justification is nothing but a bare word, seeing unapplyed; as to the Matter it is nothing, as it is not called Healing by a Medicine not applyed; nor was it ever heard that one Healing did apply another*].

Answ. Alas, alas, for the poor Church, if this be the Academies best! sorrow must excuse my Complaint! If it be an Argument it must run thus: If *Legal* (or *pro-legal*) *Righteousness* (that is, our part in Christ's Righteousness) be none to us (or none of our Justification) when not-applyed, than it is none also when it is applyed: But, *&c.*

Answ. It is none till applyed: Christ's Merits, or Legal Righteousness justifie himself, but not us till applyed: (Do you think otherwise, or do you wrangle against your self?) But I deny your Consequence: How prove you that it is *none when applyed therefore?* Or the Cure is none when the Medicine is applyed?

Perhaps you'l say, That *then* our *Personal Righteousness*, and *subordinate Justification*, is ours before Christ's Righteousness, and so the greater dependeth on, and followeth the less.

Answ. 1.

Anſw. 1. Chriſt's own Righteouſneſs is before ours. 2. His Condition, Pardon to fallen Mankind is before ours. 3. This Gift being Conditional, excepteth the non-performance of the Condition; And the nature of a Condition, is to *ſuſpend the effect of the Donation* till *performed*. 4. Therefore the performance goeth before the ſaid Effect, and our Title. 5. But it is not therefore any *cauſe* of it, but a *removal* of the *ſuſpenſion*; nor hath the Donation any other dependance on it. And is not all this beyond denial with Perſons not ſtudiouſly and learnedly miſled?

But you ſay, *It was never heard that one Healing applyed another.*

Anſw. And ſee you not that this is a *lis de nomine*, and of a name of your own introduction for illuſtration? If we were playing at a Game of Tropes, I could tell you that the *Healing* of Mens *Unbelief* is applicatory for the *healing* of their *Guilt*; And the healing of Men's Ignorance, Pride, and Wrangling about words, and frightning Men into a Conceit that it is about Life and Death, is applicatory as to the healing of the Churches Wounds and Shame. But I rather chuſe to ask you, Whether it was never heard that a *particular ſubordinate perſonal Righteouſneſs* (even *Faith* and *Repentance*) was made by God the Condition of our Right to Pardon, and Life by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs? Did you never teach your Sholars this, (in what words you thought beſt?) And yet even our Faith is a Fruit of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; but nevertheleſs the Condition of other Fruits.

If you ſay that our *Faith* or *Performance* is not

to

to be called *Righteousness*, I refer you to my Answer to Mr. *Cartwright*; And if the word *Righteousness* be not ofter (ten to one) used in Scripture for somewhat Personal, than for Christ's Righteousness imputed, then think that you have said something.

If you say, *But it justifieth not as a Righteousness, but as an Instrument.* I Answer, 1. I have said elsewhere so much of its Instrumentality, that I am ashamed to repeat it. 2. It *justifieth* not at all, (for that signifieth *efficiency*); but only maketh us capable Recipients. 3. *We are justified by it* as a *medium*, and that is a Condition performed (as aforesaid): And when that Condition by a Law is made both a *Duty* and a *Condition* of Life, the performance is by necessary resultancy [a *Righteousness*]. But we are not justified by it, as it is a *Righteousness in genere*; nor as a mere moral Virtue or Obedience to the Law of Nature; but as it is *the performance of the Condition of the Law of Grace*; and so as it is *this particular Righteousness*, and no other.

§. 13. [*In Legal Justification* (saith he) *taken precisely, either there is Remission of sin, or not: If not, What Justification is that? If yea, then Evangelical Justification is not necessary to the application of it; because the Application is supposed*, &c.]

Answ. 1. What I usually call [Evangelical Righteousness] he supposeth me to call *Justification*; which yet is true, and sound, but such as is before explained.

2. This

2. This is but the ſame again, and needeth no new anſwer; The performance of the Condition is ſtrangely here ſuppoſed to follow the *Right* or Benefit of the Gift or Covenant: If he would have the Reader think I ſaid ſo, he may as ingeniouſly tell, that I deny all Juſtification: If not, what meaneth he?

CHAP. VII.

Dr. Tullies *Quarrel about Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, conſidered.*

§. 1. CAp. 8. *pag.* 79. he ſaith, [*Becauſe no Man out of* Socinus *School, hath by his Dictates more ſharply exagitated this Imputation of Righteouſneſs, than the Author of the Aphoriſms; and it is in all mens hands, we think meet to bring into a clearer Light, the things objected by him (or more truly his Sophiſtical Cavils) whence the fitter Proſpect may be taken of almoſt the whole Controverſie*].

Anſw. That the Reader may ſee by what Weapons Theological Warriours wound the Churches Peace, and profligate brotherly Love; let him conſider how many palpable Untruths are in theſe few Lines, even in matter of Fact.

1. Let him read Dr. *Gell*, Mr. *Thorndike*, and by his own confeſſion, the Papiſts (a multitude of them)

them) and tell me true, that [*No Man out of* Socinus *School hath*, &c.] To say nothing of many late Writings near us.

2. If I have, 1. never written one word against [*Imputation of Righteousness*] there or elsewhere; 2. Yea, have oft written for it; 3. And if those very Pages be for it which he accuseth; 4. Yea, if there and elsewhere I write more for it than *Olevian*, *Ursine*, *Paræus*, *Scultetus*, *Wendeline*, *Piscator*, and all the rest of those great Divines, who are for the *Imputation* only of the Passive Righteousness of Christ, when I profess there and often, to concur with Mr. *Bradshaw*, *Grotius*, and others that take in the Active also, yea and the Habitual, yea and Divine respectively, as advancing the Merits of the Humane; If all this be notoriously true, what Epithets will you give to this Academical Doctors notorious Untruth?

3. When that Book of *Aphorisms* was suspended or retracted between twenty and thirty years ago (publickly), because of many crude Passages and unapt Words, and many Books since written by me purposely, fully opening my mind of the same things; all which he passeth wholly by, save a late Epistle; what credit is to be given to that Man's ingenuity, who pretendeth that this being in all mens hands, the answering it will so far clear all the Controversie.

§. 2. Dr. T. [*He hence assaulteth the Sentence of the Reformed; because it supposeth, as he saith, that we were in Christ, at least, legally before we believed, or were born. But what proof of the consequence doth he*

he bring?] (The reſt are but his Reaſons againſt the Conſequences, and his talk againſt me, *at pouring out Oracles*, &c.)

Anſw. 1. Is this the mode of our preſent Academical Diſputers, To paſs by the ſtating of the Controverſie, yea, to ſilence the ſtate of it, as laid down by the Author, whom he oppoſeth in that very place, (and more fully elſewhere often)? Reader, the Author of the *Aphoriſms*, pag. 45. and forward, diſtinguiſhing as Mr. *Bradſhaw* doth, of the ſeveral ſenſes of Imputation, and how Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is made ours, 1. Beginneth with their Opinion, who hold, [*That Chriſt did ſo obey in our ſtead, as that in God's eſteem, and in point of Law we were in Chriſt dying and ſuffering, and ſo in him we did both perfectly fulfil the Commands of the Law by Obedience, and the Threatnings of it by bearing the Penalty, and thus (ſay they) is Chriſt's Righteouſneſs imputed to us*, viz. *His Paſſive Righteouſneſs for the pardon of our ſins, and deliverance from the Penalty; His Active Righteouſneſs for the making of us Righteous, and giving us title to the Kingdom; And ſome ſay the Habitual Righteouſneſs of his Humane Nature, inſtead of our own Habitual Righteouſneſs; Yea, ſome add the Righteouſneſs of the Divine Nature*].

The ſecond Opinion which he reciteth is this, [*That God the Father accepteth the ſufferings and merits of his Son, as a valuable conſideration, on which he will wholly forgive and acquit the Offenders, and receive them into his favour, and give them the addition of a more excellent happineſs, ſo they will but receive his Son on the terms expreſſed in the Goſpel.*

And

And as distinct from theirs, who would thus have the *Passive Righteousness only imputed*, he professeth himself to hold with *Bradshaw*, *Grotius*, &c. that the Active also is so imputed, being *Justitia Meriti*, as well as *Personæ*, and endeavoureth to prove it: But not imputed in the first rigid sense, as if God esteemed us to *have been*, and *done*, and *suffered* our *selves in* and *by Christ*, and merited *by him*. Thus he states the Controversie; And doth this Doctor fight for Truth and Peace, by 1. passing by all this; 2. Saying, I am against Imputed Righteousness; 3. And against the Reformed? Were not all the Divines before named Reformed? Was not *Camero*, *Capellus*, *Placeus*, *Amyrald*, *Dallæus*, *Blondel*, &c. Reformed? Were not *Wotton*, *Bradshaw*, *Gataker*, &c. Reformed? Were not of late Mr. *Gibbons*, Mr. *Truman*, to pass many yet alive, Reformed? Must that Name be shamed, by appropriating it to such as this Doctor only?

2. And now let the Reader judg, with what face he denieth the Consequence, (that it *supposeth us to have been in Christ legally*, &c.) When as I put it into the Opinion opposed, and opposed no other. But I erred in saying, that [*most of our ordinary Divines*] hold it; But he more in fathering it in common on the Reformed.

§. 2. Dr. T. [2. *Such Imputation of Righteousness*, he saith, *agreeth not with Reason or Scripture: But what Reason meaneth he? Is it that vain, blind, maimed, unmeasurably procacious and tumid Reason of the Cracovian Philosophers?* —— *Next he saith*,

ſaith, Scripture is ſilent of the Imputed Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; what a ſaying is this of a Reformed Divine? ſo alſo Bellarmine, *&c.*

Anſw. Is it not a doleful caſe that *Orthodoxneſs* muſt be thus defended? Is this the way of vindicating Truth? 1. Reader, my words were theſe, (juſt like *Bradſhaws*) [*It teacheth Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneß in ſo ſtrict a ſenſe, as will neither ſtand with Reaſon, nor the Doctrine of the Scripture, much leſs with the* PHRASE *of Scripture, which mentioneth no Imputation of Chriſt or his Righteouſneſs*]. 1. Is this a denying of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs imputed? Or only of that intollerable *ſenſe* of it? 2. Do I ſay here that Scripture mentioneth not Imputed Righteouſneſs, or only that ſtrict ſenſe of it? 3. Do I not expreſly ſay, It is the *Phraſe* that is not to be found in Scripture, and the unſound ſenſe, but not the ſound?

2. And as to the Phraſe, Doth this Doctor, or can any living Man find that *Phraſe* in Scripture, [*Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed to us*]? And when he knoweth that it is not there, are not his Exclamations, and his Bug-bears [*Cracovian Reaſon*, and *Bellarmine*] his diſhonour, that hath no better Weapons to uſe againſt the Churches Peace? To tell us that the *ſenſe* or Doctrine is in Scripture, when the queſtion is of the *Phraſe*, or that Scripture ſpeaketh in his rigid ſenſe, and not in ours, is but to loſe time, and abuſe the Reader, the firſt being impertinent, and the ſecond the begging of the Queſtion.

§. 3.

§. 3. Dr. *T. The Greek word answering to Imputation, is ten times in* Rom. 4. *And what is imputed but Righteousneſs? we have then ſome imputed Righteouſneſs. The Queſtion is, only what or whoſe it is, Chriſt's or our own? Not ours, therefore Chriſts: If ours, either its the Righteouſneſs of Works, or of Faith,* &c.

Anſw. 1. But what's all this to the *Phraſe?* Could you have found that Phraſe [*Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed*], why did you not recite the words, but *Reaſon* as for the ſenſe?

2. Is that your way of Diſputation, to prove that the Text ſpeaketh of the *Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*, when the Queſtion was only, *In what ſenſe?* What kind of Readers do you expect, that ſhall take this for rational, candid, and a Plea for Truth?

3. But to a Man that cometh unprejudiced, it is moſt plain, that *Paul* meaneth by [*imputing it for Righteouſneſs*] that the Perſon was or is, *accounted, reckoned*, or *judged Righteous*, where *Righteouſneſs* is mentioned as the *formal Relation* of the Believer: ſo that what-ever be the matter of it (of which next) the *formal Relation* ſure is our *own*, and ſo here ſaid: And if it be from the matter of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, yet that muſt be *our own*, by your Opinion. And it muſt be *our own*, *in* and *to* the proper *Effects*, in mine. But ſure it is not the ſame *numerical* formal Relation of [*Righteouſneſs*] that is in Chriſt's *Perſon*, and *in* ours: And it's that formal Relation, as in *Abraham*, and not in Chriſt, that is called *Abraham*'s Reputed Righteouſneſs

ouſneſs in the Text: I ſcarce think you will ſay the contrary.

§. 4. Dr. T. [*But Faith is not imputed to us for Righteouſneſs.*

Anſw. Expreſly againſt the words of the Holy Ghoſt there oft repeated. Is this defending the Scripture, expreſly to deny it? Should not reverence, and our ſubſcription to the Scripture ſufficiently rather teach us to diſtinguiſh, and tell in *what ſenſe it is imputed*, and in *what not*, than thus to deny, without diſtinction, what it doth ſo oft aſſert? Yea, the Text nameth *nothing elſe as ſo imputed, but Faith.*

§. 5. *If it be imputed, it is either as ſome Virtue, or Humane Work, (the* τὸ *Credere) or as it apprehendeth and applyeth Chriſt's Righteouſneſs? Not (the firſt) —— If Faith be imputed relatively only, as it applyeth to a Sinner the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, it's manifeſt that it's the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt only that is imputed, and that Faith doth no more to Righteouſneſs, than an empty hand to receive an Alms.*

Anſw. 1. Sure it doth as a voluntarily receiving hand, and not as a mere *empty hand.* And voluntary grateful Reception may be the Condition of a Gift.

2. You and I ſhall ſhortly find that it will be the Queſtion on which we ſhall be Juſtified or Condemned; not only whether we received Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, but whether by Faith we received Chriſt in all the Eſſentials of his Office, and to all the eſſential ſaving Uſes: Yea, whether according to the ſenſe of the Baptiſmal Covenant, we firſt be-

lievingly received, and gave up our ſelves to God the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*, and after performed ſincerely that Covenant.

3. But let me defend the Word of God: Faith is imputed for Righteouſneſs, even *this Faith now deſcribed*; 1. *Remotely*, *ex materiæ aptitudine*, for its fitneſs to its formal Office; And that fitneſs is, 1. Becauſe it is an *Act of Obedience to God*, or *morally good*, (for a *bad* or *indifferent Act* doth not juſtifie). 2. More ſpecially as it is the *receiving*, *truſting*, and *giving* up *our ſelves* to God the *Father*, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to the proper ends of Redemption, or a ſuitable Reception of the freely offered Gift; and ſo connoteth Chriſt the Object (for the Object is eſſential to the Act *in ſpecie*). 2. But proximately *Faith* is ſo *reputed*, or imputed, as it is the *performance* of the *Condition* of the Juſtifying Covenant or Donation.

And to be *imputed* for *Righteouſneſs*, includeth, That [*It is the part required of us by the Law of Grace, to make us partakers of the Benefits of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, which meriteth Salvation for us inſtead of a legal and perfect Righteouſneſs of our own*, (which we have not). Or, [*Whereas we fell ſhort of a Righteouſneſs of Innocency, Chriſt by ſuch a Righteouſneſs hath merited our Pardon and Salvation, and given title to them by a New Covenant of Grace, which maketh this Faith the Condition of our Title; and if we do this, we ſhall be judged evangelically Righteous; that is, ſuch as have done all that was neceſſary to their right in Chriſt and the ſaid Benefits, and therefore have ſuch a Right*].

This is plain Engliſh, and plain Truth, wrangle no more againſt it, and againſt the very Letter of the

the Text, and againſt your Brethren and the Churches Concord, by making Men believe that there are grievous Differences, where there are none.

Reader, I was going on to Anſwer the reſt, but my time is ſhort, Death is at the door: Thou ſeeſt what kind of Work I have of it, even to detect a Learned Man's Overſights, and temerarious Accuſations. The wearineſs will be more to thee and me, than the profit: I find little before, but what I have before anſwered here, and oft elſewhere; And therefore I will here take up, only adding one Chapter of Defence of that Conciliation which I attempted in an Epiſtle to Mr. *W. Allens* Book of the Two Covenants, and this Doctor, like an Enemy of Peace, aſſaulteth.

CHAP. VIII.

The Concord of Proteſtants in the Matter of Juſtification defended, againſt Dr. Tullies *Oppoſitions, who would make Diſcord under pretence of proving it.*

§. 1. WHile *Truth* is pretended by moſt, that by *envious ſtriving* introduce *Confuſion*, and *every evil Work*, it uſually falleth out by God's juſt Judgment, that ſuch are almoſt as oppoſite to *Truth*, as to *Charity* and *Peace*. What more palpable inſtances can there be, than ſuch as on ſuch accounts have lately aſſaulted me: Mr. *Danvers*, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, &c. and now this Learned Doctor. The very ſtream of all his Oppoſition againſt me about Imputation, is enforced by this oft repeated Forgery, that I deny *all Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs:* Yea, he neither by *fear*, *modeſty*, or *ingenuity*, was *reſtrained* from writing, *pag.* 117. [*Omnem ludibrio habet Imputationem*] [*He derideth all Imputation*]. Judg by this what credit contentious Men deſerve.

§. 2. The conciliatory Propoſitions which I laid down in an Epiſtle to Mr. *W. Allens* Book, I will here tranſcribe, that the Reader may ſee what it is that theſe Militant Doctors war againſt.

Leſt

Left any who know not how to ſtop in mediocrity, ſhould be tempted by Socinians or Papiſts, to think that we countenance any of their Errors, or that our Differences in the point of Juſtification by Faith or Works, are greater than indeed they are; and leſt any weak Opinionative Perſons, ſhould clamour unpeaceably againſt their Brethren, and think to raiſe a name to themſelves for their differing Notions; I ſhall here give the Reader ſuch evidences of our real Concord, as ſhall ſilence that Calumny.

Though ſome few Lutherans did, upon peeviſh ſuſpiciouſneſs againſt *George Major* long ago, aſſert, That [Good Works are not neceſſary to Salvation]: And though ſome few good Men, whoſe Zeal without Judgment doth better ſerve their own turn than the Churches, are jealous, leſt all the good that is aſcribed to Man, be a diſhonour to God; and therefore ſpeak as if God were honoured moſt by ſaying the worſt words of our ſelves; and many have uncomely and irregular Notions about theſe Matters: And though ſome that are addicted to ſidings, do take it to be their Godly Zeal to cenſure and reproach the more underſtanding ſort, when they moſt groſly err themſelves: And though too many of the People are carried about through injudiciouſneſs and temptations to falſe Doctrines and evil Lives; yet is the Argument of Proteſtants thus manifeſted.

1. They all affirm that Chriſt's Sacrifice, with his Holineſs and perfect Obedience, are the meritorious Cauſe of the forgiving Covenants, and of our Pardon and Juſtification thereby, and of our Right to Life Eternal, which it giveth us. And that this Price was not paid or given in it ſelf im-

mediately to us, but to God for us; and so, that our foresaid Benefits are its Effects.

2. They agree that Christ's Person and ours were not really the same; and therefore that the same Righteousness, which is an Accident of one, cannot possibly be an Accident of the other.

3. They all detest the Conceit, that God should aver, and repute a Man to have done that which he never did.

4. They all agree that Christ's Sacrifice and Merits are really so effectual to procure our Pardon, Justification, Adoption, and right to the sealing Gift of the Holy Ghost, and to Glory, upon our Faith and Repentance; that God giveth us all these benefits of the New-Covenant as certainly for the sake of Christ and his Righteousness, as if we had satisfied him, and merited them our selves: and that thus far Christ's Righteousness is ours in its Effects, and imputed to us, in that we are thus used for it, and shall be judged accordingly.

5. They all agree, that we are justified by none, but a practical or working Faith.

6. And that this Faith is the Condition of the Promise, or Gift of Justification and Adoption.

7. And that Repentance is a Condition also, though (as it is not the same with Faith, as Repentance of Unbelief is) on another aptitudinal account; even as a willingness to be cured, and a willingness to take one for my Physician, and to trust him in the use of his Remedies, are on several accounts the Conditions on which that Physician will undertake the Cure, or as willingness to return to subjection and thankful acceptance of a purchased Pardon, and of the Purchasers Love and future

future Authority, are the Conditions of a Rebel's Pardon.

8. And they all agree, that in the first instant of a Man's Conversion or Believing, he is entred into a state of Justification, before he hath done any outward Works: and that so it is true, that good Works follow the Justified, and go not before his initial Justification: as also in the sense that *Austin* spake it, who took Justification, for that which we call Sanctification or Conversion.

9. And they all agree, that Justifying Faith is such a receiving affiance, as is both in the Intellect and the Will; and therefore as in the Will, participateth of some kind of Love to the justifying Object, as well as to Justification.

10. And that no Man can chuse or use Christ as a Means (so called, in respect to his own intention) to bring him to God the Father, who hath not so much love to God, as to take him for his end in the use of that means.

11. And they agree, that we shall be all judged according to our Works, by the Rule of the Covenant of Grace, though not for our Works, by way of commutative, or legal proper merit. And Judging is the Genus, whose Species is Justifying and Condemning: and to be judged according to our Works, is nothing but to be justified or condemned according to them.

12. They all agree, that no Man can possibly merit of God in point of Commutative Justice, nor yet in point of Distributive or Governing Justice, according to the Law of Nature or Innocency, as *Adam* might have done, nor by the Works of the Mosaical Law.

13. They all agree, that no Works of Mans are to be truſted in, or pleaded, but all excluded, and the Conceit of them abhorred.

1. As they are feigned to be againſt, or inſtead of the free Mercy of God.

2. As they are againſt, or feigned, inſtead of the Sacrifice, Obedience, Merit, or Interceſſion of Chriſt.

3. Or as ſuppoſed to be done of our ſelves, without the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt.

4. Or as ſuppoſed falſly to be perfect.

5. Or as ſuppoſed to have any of the afore-diſclaimed Merit.

6. Or as materially conſiſting in Moſaical Obſervances.

7. Much more in any ſuperſtitious Inventions.

8. Or in any Evil miſtaken to be Good.

9. Or as any way inconſiſtent with the Tenor of the freely pardoning Covenant. In all theſe ſenſes Juſtification by Works is diſclaimed by all Proteſtants at leaſt.

14. Yet all agree, that we are created to good Works in Chriſt Jeſus, which God hath ordained, that we ſhould walk therein; and that he, that nameth the Name of Chriſt, muſt depart from iniquity, or elſe he hath not the Seal of God; and that he that is born of God ſinneth not; that is, predominantly. And that all Chriſt's Members are Holy, Purified, zealous of Good Works, cleanſing themſelves from all filthineſs of Fleſh and Spirit, that they might perfect Holineſs in God's fear, doing good to all Men, as loving their Neighbours as themſelves; and that if any Man have not the

Sancti-

Sanctifying Spirit of Christ, he is none of his, nor without Holiness can see God.

15. They all judg reverently and charitably of the Ancients, that used the word [Merit of Good Works], because they meant but a moral aptitude for the promised Reward, according to the Law of Grace through Christ.

16. They confess the thing thus described themselves, however they like not the name of Merit, lest it should countenance proud and carnal Conceits.

17. They judg no Man to be Heretical for the bare use of that word, who agreeth with them in the sense.

18. In this sense they agree, that our Gospel-Obedience is such a necessary aptitude to our Glorification, as that Glory (though a free Gift) is yet truly a reward of this Obedience.

19. And they agree, that our final Justification by Sentence at the Day of Judgment doth pass upon the same Causes, Reasons, and Conditions, as our Glorification doth.

20. They all agree, that all faithful Ministers must bend the labour of their Ministry in publick and private, for promoting of Holiness and good Works, and that they must difference by Discipline between the Obedient and the Disobedient. And O! that the Papists would as zealously promote Holiness and good Works in the World, as the true serious Protestants do, whom they factiously and peevishly accuse as Enemies to them; and that the Opinion, Disputing, and name of good Works, did not cheat many wicked Persons into self-flattery and Perdition, while they are void of that which they

they diſpute for. Then would not the Mahometans and Heathens be deterred from Chriſtianity by the wickedneſs of theſe nominal Chriſtians, that are near them: nor would the ſerious practice of that Chriſtianity, which themſelves in general profeſs, be hated, ſcorned, and perſecuted by ſo many, both Proteſtants and Papiſts; nor would ſo many contend that they are of the True Religion, while they are really of no Religion at all any further, than the Hypocrites Picture and Carcaſs may be called Religion: Were Men but reſolved to be ſerious Learners, ſerious Lovers, ſerious Practiſers according to their knowledg, and did not live like mockers of God, and ſuch as look toward the Life to come in jeſt, or unbelief, God would vouchſafe them better acquaintance with the True Religion than moſt Men have.

O.

§. 3. One would think now that this ſhould meet with no ſharp Oppoſition, from any Learned lover of Peace; and that it ſhould anſwer for it ſelf, and need no defence. But this Learned Man for all that, among the reſt of his Military Exploits, muſt here find ſome Matter for a Triumph.

And 1. *Pag.* 18. he aſſaulteth the third Propoſ. [*They all deteſt the Conceit, that God ſhould aver, and repute a Man to have done that which he never did*].

And is not this true? Do any ſober Men deny it, and charge God with Error or Untruth? Will not this Man of Truth and Peace, give us leave to be thus far agreed, when we are ſo indeed?

But

But ſaith he, [*Yea, the Orthodox abhor the contrary, if* [*to have done it*] *be taken* in ſenſu forenſi, *(for in a Phyſical and Perſonal, they abhor it not, but deride it): Doth the Aphoriſt abhor theſe and ſuch-like ſayings,* [*We are dead, buried, riſen from the Dead with Chriſt ?*]

Anſw. 1. Take notice Reader, that it is but the *Words*, and not the *Matter* that he here aſſaulteth; ſo that all here ſeemeth but *lis de nomine*. He before, *pag.* 84. extolleth *Chryſoſtom* for thus expounding, [*He made him ſin for us*]; *that is, to be condemned as an Offender, and to die as a Blaſphemer.* And this ſenſe of Imputation we all admit; (But *Chryſoſtom* in that place oft telleth us, That by [Sin] he meaneth both one counted a wicked Man by his Perſecutors, [not by God] and one that ſuffered that curſed Death, which was due to wicked curſed Men: And which of us deny not Juſtification by Works as *Chryſoſtom* doth? I ſubſcribe to his words, [*It is God's Righteouſneſs; ſeeing it is not of Works (for in them it were neceſſary that there be found no blot) but of Grace, which blotteth out and extinguiſheth all ſin: And this begetteth us a double benefit, for it ſuffereth us not to be lift up in mind, becauſe it is all the Gift of God, and it ſheweth the greatneſs of the benefit*]. This is as apt an Expreſſion of my Judgment of *Works* and *Grace* as I could chuſe. But it's given to ſome Men to extol that in one Man, which they fervently revile in others. How frequently is *Chryſoſtom* by many accuſed as favouring Free-Will, and Man's Merits, and ſmelling of Pelagianiſm? And he that is acquainted with *Chryſoſtom*, muſt know, That he includeth all theſe things in Juſtification. 1. Remiſ-

ſion

ſion of the Sin, as to the Puniſhment. 2. *Remiſſion* of it by *Mortification*, (for ſo he calleth it, in *Rom.* 3. *p.* (*mihi*) 63.) 3. *Right to Life* freely given for Chriſt's ſake. 4. And *Inherent Righteouſneſs* through Faith: And he oft ſaith, That this is called the *Righteouſneſs of God, becauſe as God, who is living, quickeneth the dead, and as he that is ſtrong giveth ſtrength to the weak; ſo he that is Righteous, doth ſuddenly make them Righteous that were lapſed into ſin*], as he there alſo ſpeaketh. And he oft tells us, It is *Faith it ſelf*, and not only Chriſt believed in, that is imputed for Righteouſneſs, or Juſtifieth: And in *Rom.* 4. *p.* 80. he calleth the Reward, [the *Retribution of Faith*]. And *pag.* 89. he thus conjoyneth [*Faith and Chriſt's Death*] to the Queſtion, *How Men obnoxious to ſo much ſin are juſtified*, [*he ſheweth that he blotted out all ſin, that he might confirm what he ſaid, both from the Faith of* Abraham *by which he was juſtified, and from our Saviours Death, by which we are delivered from ſin*]. But this is on the by.

2. But ſaith Dr. *T. The Orthodox abhor the contrary* in ſenſu forenſi.

Anſw. How eaſie is it to challenge the Titles of *Orthodox*, *Wiſe*, or *good Men* to ones ſelf? And who is not Orthodox, himſelf being Judg? But it ſeems with him, no Man muſt paſs for Orthodox that is not in ſo groſs an error of his Mind, (if theſe words, and not many better that are contrary muſt be the diſcovery of it) *viz.* That will not ſay, that *in ſenſu forenſi, God eſteemeth Men to have done that which they never did.* The beſt you can make of this is, that you cover the ſame ſenſe, which I plainlier expreſs, with this illfavoured Phraſe

Phraſe of Man's inventing: But if indeed you mean any more than I by your *ſenſus forenſis*, *viz.* that ſuch a *ſuffering* and *meriting* for us may, in the lax improper way of ſome Lawyers ſpeaking, be called, [*Our own Doing*, *Meriting*, *Suffering*, &c.] I have proved, that the Doctrine denied by me, ſubverteth the Goſpel of Chriſt.

Reader, I remember what *Grotius* (then Orthodox, thirty years before his Death) in that excellent Letter of Church-Orders, Predeſtination, Perſeverance, and Magiſtrates, animadverting on *Molinæus*, ſaith, *How great an injury thoſe Divines, who turn the Chriſtian Doctrine into unintelligible Notions and Controverſies, do to Chriſtian Magiſtrates; becauſe it is the duty of Magiſtrates to diſcern and preſerve neceſſary ſound Doctrine, which theſe Men would make them unable to diſcern.* The ſame I muſt ſay of their injury to all Chriſtians, becauſe all ſhould hold faſt that which is proved True and Good, which this ſort of Men would diſable them to diſcern. We juſtly blame the Papiſts for locking up the Scripture, and performing their Worſhip in an unknown Tongue. And alas, what abundance of well-meaning Divines do the ſame thing by undigeſted Terms and Notions, and unintelligible Diſtinctions, not adapted to the Matter, but cuſtomarily uſed from ſome Perſons reverenced by them that led the way? It is ſo in their Tractates, both of Theology and other Sciences; and the great and uſeful Rule, *Verba Rebus aptanda ſunt*, is laid aſide: or rather, Men that underſtand not Matter, are like enough to be little skilful in the expreſſing of it: And as Mr. *Pemble* ſaith, A cloudy unintelligible ſtile, uſually ſignifieth a cloudy

dy unintelligent Head, (to that ſenſe): And as Mr. *J. Humfrey* tells Dr. *Fullwood*, (in his unanſwerable late Plea for the Conformiſts againſt the charge of Schiſm) *pag.* 29. [*So overly are men ordinarily wont to ſpeak at the firſt ſight, againſt that which others have long thought upon*]; that ſome Men think, that the very jingle of a diſtinction not underſtood is warrant enough for their reproaching that Doctrine as dangerous and unſound, which hath coſt another perhaps twenty times as many hard ſtudies, as the Reproachers ever beſtowed on that Subject.

To deliver thee from thoſe Learned Obſcurities, read but the Scripture impartially, without their Spectacles and ill-deviſed Notions, and all the Doctrine of Juſtification that is neceſſary, will be plain to thee: And I will venture again to fly ſo far from flattering thoſe, called Learned Men, who expect it, as to profeſs that I am perſwaded the common ſort of honeſt unlearned Chriſtians, (even Plowmen and Women) do better underſtand the Doctrine of Juſtification, than many great Diſputers will ſuffer themſelves or others to underſtand it, by reaſon of their foreſtalling ill-made Notions: theſe unlearned Perſons commonly conceive, 1. That Chriſt in his own Perſon, as a Mediator, did by his perfect Righteouſneſs and Sufferings, merit for us the free pardon of all our ſins, and the Gift of his Spirit and Life Eternal, and hath promiſed Pardon to all that are Penitent Believers, and Heaven to all that ſo continue, and ſincerely obey him to the end; and that all our after-failings, as well as our former ſins, are freely pardoned by the Sacrifice, Merits, and Interceſſion of Chriſt, who alſo giveth

us his Grace for the performance of his impoſed Conditions, and will judg us, as we have or have not performed them]. Believe but this plain Doctrine, and you have a righter underſtanding of Juſtification, than many would let you quietly enjoy, who tell you, [That Faith is not imputed for Righteouſneſs; that it juſtifieth you only as an Inſtrumental Cauſe, and only as it is the reception of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and that no other Act of Faith is juſtifying, and that God eſteemeth us to have been perfectly Holy and Righteous, and fulfilled all the Law, and died for our own ſins, in or by Chriſt, and that he was politically the very Perſon of every Believing Sinner]; with more ſuch like.

And as to this diſtinction which this Doctor will make a Teſt of the Orthodox, (that is, Men of of his Size and Judgment) you need but this plain explication of it.

1. *In Law-ſenſe, a Man is truly and fitly ſaid himſelf to have done that, which the Law or his Contract alloweth him to do either by himſelf or another*; (as to do an Office, or pay a Debt by a Subſtitute or Vicar). For ſo I do it by my Inſtrument, and the Law is fulfilled and not broken by me, becauſe I was at liberty which way to do it. In this ſenſe I deny that we ever fulfilled all the Law by Chriſt; and that ſo to hold ſubverts all Religion as a pernicious Hereſie.

2. But in a tropical improper ſenſe, he may be ſaid to [*be eſteemed of God to have done what Chriſt did; who ſhall have the benefits of Pardon, Grace, and Glory thereby merited, in the manner and meaſure given by the free Mediator, as certainly as if he had*

had done it himself]. In this improper ſenſe we agree to the *Matter*, but are ſorry that improper words ſhould be uſed as a ſnare againſt ſound Doctrine, and the Churches Love and Concord. And yet muſt we not be allowed *Peace?*

§. 4. But my free Speech here maketh me remember how ſharply the Doctor expounded and applyed one word in the retracted Aphoriſms: I ſaid (not of the *Men*, but of the *wrong Opinion* oppoſed by me) [*It fondly ſuppoſeth a Medium betwixt one that is juſt, and one that is no ſinner*] *one that hath his ſin or guilt taken away, and one that hath his unrighteouſneſs taken away: It's true in bruits and inſenſibles that are not ſubjects capable of Juſtice*, there is, &c. *There is a Negative Injuſtice which denominateth the Subject* non-juſtum, *but not* injuſtum, *where Righteouſneſs is not due. But where there is the* debitum habendi, *its privative.* The Doctor learnedly tranſlateth firſt the word [*fondly*] by [*ſtolide*]; and next he (*fondly*, though not *ſtolidè*) would perſwade the Reader, that it is ſaid of the *Men*, though himſelf tranſlate it [*Doctrina*].

And next he bloweth his Trumpet to the War, with this exclamation, [*Stolide! O vocis mollitiem, & modeſtiam! O ſtolidos Eccleſiæ Reformatæ Clariſſimos Heroas! Aut ignoravit certè, aut ſcire ſe diſſimulat, (quod affine eſt calumniæ) quid iſti ſtatuant, quos loquitur, ſtolidi Theologi*].

Anſw. 1. How blind are ſome in their own Cauſe? Why did not Conſcience at the naming of Calumnie ſay, [*I am now committing it?*] It were better write in Engliſh, if Latin tranſlations muſt needs

needs be so false! we use the word [*fond*] in our Country, in another sense than [*foolish*]; with us it signifieth any byassed Inclination, which beyond reason propendeth to one side: and so we use to say, That *Women are fond of their Children*, or of any thing *over-loved*: But perhaps he can use his Logick, to gather by consequences the Title of the *Person*, from the Title of his *Opinion*, and to gather [*foolishly*] by consequence out of [*fondly*]. To all which I can but answer, That if he had *made himself* the *Translator* of my Words, and the Judg of my Opinions; if this be his best, he should not be chosen as such by me. But it may be he turned to *Riders Dictionary*, & found there [*fondly, vide foolishly*].

2. The *Stolidi Theologi* then is his own phrase! And in my Opinion, another Mans Pen might better have called the Men of his own Opinion [*Ecclesiæ Reformatæ clarissimos Heroas*] compared with others! I take *Gataker*, *Bradshaw*, *Wotton*, *Camero*, and his followers; *Ursine*, *Olevian*, *Piscator*, *Paræus*. *Wendeline*, and multitudes such, to be as famous Heroes as himself: But this also on the by.

§. 5. But I must tell him whether I abhor the Scripture Phrase, [*We are dead, buried, and risen with Christ*].

I answer, No; nor will I abhor to say, That *in sensu forensi*, *I am one political Person with Christ*, and am *perfectly holy* and *obedient* by and *in him*, and died and redeemed my self by him, when he shall prove them to be Scripture Phrases: But I desire the Reader not to be so *fond*, (pardon the word) as by this bare question to be enticed to believe, that it is any of the meaning of those Texts that use that Phrase which he mentioneth, that

[*Legally*, or *in ſenſu forenſi*, *every Believer is eſteemed by God to have* himſelf perſonally *died a violent death on the Croſs*, *and to have been buried*, *and to have riſen again*, and aſcended into Heaven, nor yet to be now there in Glory, becauſe Chriſt did and doth all this in our very Legal Perſon. Let him but 1. conſider the Text, 2. and Expoſitors, 3. and the Analogy of Faith, and he will find another ſenſe; *viz.* That *we ſo live by Faith on a dying*, *buried*, *riſen and glorified Saviour*, *as that as ſuch he dwelleth objectively in our Hearts*, *and we partake ſo of the Fruits of his Death*, *Burial*, *and Reſurrection*, *and Glory*, *as that we follow him in a Holy Communion*, *being dead and buried to the World and Sin*, *and riſen to newneſs of Life*, *believing that by his Power we ſhall perſonally*, *after our death and burial*, *riſe alſo unto Glory*. I will confeſs that we are perfectly *holy and obedient by and in Chriſt*, as far as we are now *dead*, *buried*, and *riſen* in him.

§. 6. And here I will ſo far look back, as to remember, That he (as ſome others) confidently telleth us, That [*the Law bound us both to perfect Obedience*, *and to puniſhment for our ſin*, *and therefore pardon by our own ſuffering in Chriſt*, *may ſtand with the reputation*, *that we were perfectly Obedient and Righteous in Chriſt*.]

Anſw. And to what purpoſe is it to diſpute long, where ſo notorious a contradiction is not only not diſcerned, but obtruded as *tantum non* neceſſary to our Orthodoxneſs, if not to our Salvation? I ask him,

1. Was not Chriſt as our Mediator perfectly holy habitually, and actually, without Original or Actual Sin?

2. If

2. If all this be reputed to be *in se*, our own as *subjected in* and *done* by *our selves political*, or *in sensu forensi*; Are we not then reputed *in foro*, to have no original or actual sin, but to have innocently fulfilled all the Law, from the first hour of our lives to the last? Are we reputed *innocent* in Christ, as to *one* part only of our lives, (if so, which is it?) or as to all?

3. If as to all, is it not a *contradiction* that in Law-sense, we are reputed perfectly Holy and Innocent, and yet sinners.

4. And can he have need of Sacrifice or Pardon, that is reputed never to have sinned (legally)?

5. If he will say that in Law-sense, we have or are *two Persons*, let him expound the word *Persons* only, as of *Qualities* and *Relations*, (nothing to our Case in hand); or else say also, That as we are holy and perfect in one of our own Persons, and *sinful*, *unrighteous*, or *ungodly* in another, so a Man may be in Heaven in one of his own Persons, and on Earth, yea and in Hell in the other: And if he mean that the same Man is *justified* in his Person in Christ, and condemned in his other Person; consider which of these is the *Physical* Person, for I think its that which is like to suffer.

§. 7. *pag.* 224. He hath another touch at my Epistle, but gently forbeareth contradiction as to *Num.* 8. And he saith so little to the 11*th*, as needeth no answer.

§. 8. *pag.* 127. He assaulteth the first *Num.* of *N.* 13. That *we all agree against any conceit of Works that are against or instead of the free Mercy of God*].

And what hath he against this? Why that

which taketh up many pages of his Book, and ſeemeth his chief ſtrength in moſt of his Conteſt, *viz.* [*The Papiſts ſay the ſame*] and [ſo ſaith *Bellarmine*]. It's ſtrange that the ſame kind of Men that deride *Fanatick Sectaries*, for crying out in Church-Controverſies, [*O Antichriſtian Popery, Bellarmine*, &c.] ſhould be of the ſame Spirit, and take the ſame courſe in greater Matters, and not perceive it, nor acknowledg their agreement with them! But as Mr. *J. Humfrey* ſaith in the foreſaid Book of the word [*Schiſm, Schiſm*] oft canted out againſt them, that will not ſacrilegiouſly ſurrender their Conſciences, or deſert their Miniſtry, [*The great Bear hath been ſo oft led through the ſtreets, that now the Boys lay by all fear, and laugh or make ſport at him*] ſo ſay I of this Sectarian Bugbear, [*Popery, Antichriſtian, Bellarmine*] either the Papiſts really ſay as we do, or they do not. If not, is this Doctor more to be blamed for making them *better than* they are, or for making *us worſe?* which ever it be, *Truth* ſhould defend *Truth*. If they do, I heartily rejoyce, and it ſhall be none of my labour any more (whatever I did in my *Confeſſion of Faith*) to prove that they do not. Let who will manage ſuch ungrateful Work. For my part, I take it for a better Character of any Opinion, that Papiſts and Proteſtants agree in it, than that the Proteſtants hold it alone. And ſo much for [*Papiſts* and *Bellarmine*] though I think I know better what they teach, than his Book will truly tell me.

§. 9. But he addeth, [*Humane Juſtifying Works are in reality adverſe to the free Mercy of God, therefore to be accounted of no value to Righteouſneſs*].

Anſw.

Arſw. 1. But whoſe phraſe is *Juſtifying Works?*

2. Doth not the *Holy Ghoſt* ſay, That a *Man* is *juſtified by Works*, and *not by Faith only?* Jam. 2.

3. Doth not Chriſt ſay, *By thy words thou ſhalt be juſtified?*

4. Do not I over and over tell the World, That I hold Juſtification by Works in no ſenſe, but as ſignifying the ſame as [*According to Works*] which you own? And ſo both *Name* and *Thing* are confeſſed by you to be Scriptural.

5. I have before deſired the Reader to turn to the words, [*Righteous, Righteouſneſs, Juſtification*, &c.] in his Concordance. And if there he find *Righteouſneſs* mentioned as conſiſting in ſome Acts of Man, many hundred times, let him next ſay if he dare, that they are to *be had in no price to Righteouſneſs:* Or let him read the Texts cited by me in my *Confeſſion of Faith.*

6. Becauſe, Faith, Repentance, Love, Obedience, are that whoſe ſincerity is to be judged in order to our Life or Death ere long; I will not ſay that they are to be vilified as to ſuch a Righteouſneſs or Juſtification, as conſiſteth in our vindication from the charge of Impenitency, Infidelity, Unholineſs, Hypocriſie, *&c.* The reading of *Mat.* 25. reſolved me for this Opinion.

§. 10. Next he noteth our deteſting ſuch Works as are againſt or inſtead of Chriſt's Sacrifice, Righteouſneſs, Merits, *&c.* To this we have the old Cant, *The Papiſts ſay the like.*

Reader, I proved that the generality of Proteſtants are agreed in all thoſe twenty Particulars, even in all the material Doctrines about Man's Works and Juſtification, while this warlike Doctor

would ſet us all together by the ears ſtill, he is over-ruled to aſſert that the Papiſts alſo are agreed with us. The more the better, I am glad if it be ſo, and will here end with ſo welcome a Concluſion, that maketh us all herein to be Friends: only adding, That when he ſaith that [*ſuch are all Works whatever*, (even Faith it ſelf) *which are called into the very leaſt part of Juſtification*]; even as a *Condition or ſubordinate perſonal Evangelical Righteouſneſs*, ſuch as Chriſt and *James*, and a hundred Texts of Scripture aſſert; I anſwer, I cannot believe him, till I ceaſe believing the Scriptures to be true; which I hope will never be: And am ſorry that ſo worthy a Man can believe ſo groſs an Opinion, upon no better reaſons than he giveth: And yet imagine, that had I the opportunity of free conference with him, I could force him to manifeſt, That he himſelf differeth from us but in meer words or ſecond Notions, while he hotly proclaimeth a greater diſcord.

AN ANSVVER TO Dr. *TULLIES* Angry Letter.

By *Rich. Baxter.*

LONDON,
Printed for *Nevil Simmons* and *Jonath. Robinson*, at the Princes-Arms and Golden-Lion, in St. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1675.

308:04

An Answer to Dr. Tullies *Angry Letter.*

Reverend Sir,

IF I had not before *perceived* and *lamented* the great *Sin of Contenders*, the dangerous *snare for ignorant* Christians, and the *great Calamity* of the Church, by making *Verbal Differences* seem *Material*, and variety of some Arbitrary Logical Notions, to seem *tantum non*, a variety of Religions; and by frightning Men out of their Charity, Peace, and Communion, by Bugbear-Names, of this or that *Heresie* or *dangerous Opinion*, which is indeed but a Spectrum or Fantasm of a dreaming or melancholy Brain, your *Justificatio Paulina*, and your *Letter* to me, might be sufficient means of my full Conviction. And if once reading of your Writings do not yet more increase my love of the *Christian simplicity*, and plain old *Divinity*, and the amicable Communion of practical Christians upon those terms, and not medling with Controversies in a militant way, till by long impartial studies they are well understood, I must

muſt confeſs my non-proficience is very unexcuſable.

With your ſelf I have no great buſineſs: I am not ſo vain as to think my ſelf able to *underſtand you*, or to be *underſtood* by you: and I muſt not be ſo bold as to tell you why, much leſs will I be ſo injurious to the Reader, as by a *particular examining all your words*, to extort a confeſſion that their *ſenſe* is *leſs* or *worſe* than I could wiſh: For *cui bono?* What would this do but more offend you? And idle words are as great a fault in writing as in talk: If I have been guilty of too many, I muſt not ſo much add to my fault, as a too particular examination of ſuch Books would be. But for the ſake of your *Academical Youth*, whom you thought meet to allarm by your Caution, I have anſwered ſo much of your Treatiſe as I thought neceſſary to help even Novices to anſwer the reſt themſelves. For their ſakes (though I delight not to offend you) I muſt ſay, That if they would not be deceived by ſuch Books as yours, it is not an *Anſwer* to them that muſt be their preſervative, but an orderly ſtudying of the Doctrines handled; Let them but learn truly the ſeveral ſenſes of the word [*Juſtification*], and the *ſeveral ſorts*, and *what they are*, and ſtill conſtrain *ambiguous words* to confeſs *their ſenſe*, and they will need no other Anſwer to ſuch Writings.

And as to your Letter (paſſing by the ſpume and paſſion) I think theſe few Animadverſions may ſuffice.

§. I. Between twenty and thirty years ago, I did in a private Diſputation prove our guilt of the ſins of our nearer Parents; and becauſe many doubted

doubted of it, I have oft ſince in other writings mentioned it: About three years ago, having two Books of Mr. *William Allens* in my hand to peruſe, in order to a Publication, (a *Perſwaſive to Unity*, and a *Treatiſe of the Two Covenants*); in a Preface to the latter, I ſaid, [*That moſt Writers, if not moſt Chriſtians, do greatly darken the Sacred Doctrine, by overlooking the Intereſt of Children in the Actions of their nearer Parents, and think that they participate of no guilt, and ſuffer for no original ſin, but* Adam's *only*, &c.] You faſtened on this, and *warned ſeriouſly the Juniors, not raſhly to believe one that brings forth ſuch Paradoxes of his* (or *that*) *Theologie*, which you added to your [*O cæcos ante Theologos quicunque unquam fuiſtis*]: The charge was expreſſed by [*aliud inveniſſe peccatum Originale, multo citerius quam quod ab* Adamo *traductum eſt*]. Hereupon I thought it enough to publiſh that old private Diſputation, which many before had ſeen with various Cenſures: Now you ſend me in your Letter the ſtrange tidings of the ſucceſs: You that deterred your *Juniors* by ſo frighful a warning, ſeem now not only to *agree with me*, that we *are guilty of our nearer Parents ſin*, and contract additional pravity from them as ſuch, (which was my Aſſertion) but over-do all others, and Truth it ſelf in your Agreement! Now you take it for an injury to be reported to think otherwiſe herein than I do: yea, and add, [*Which neither I, nor any Body elſe I know of, denies as to the thing, though in the extent, and other circumſtances, all are not agreed, and you may in that enjoy your Opinion for me*]. This is too kind: I am loth to tell you how many

that

that I know, and have read, deny it, leſt I tempt you to repent of your Agreement.

But doth the World yet need a fuller evidence, that ſome Men are *de materiâ* agreed with them, whom they raiſe the Country againſt by their Accuſations and Suſpicions?

But ſurely what paſſion or ſpatling ſoever it hath occaſioned from you, I reckon that my labour is not loſt: I may tell your *Juniors*, that I have ſped extraordinary well, when I have procured the publiſhed conſent of ſuch a Doctor. Either you were of this mind *before* or *not*: If not, it's well you are brought to confeſs the Truth, though not to confeſs a former Error. If yea, then it's well that ſo loud and wide a ſeeming diſagreement is confeſſed to be none, that your Juniors may take warning, and not be frightned from Love and Concord by every melancholy Allarm.

Yea, you declare your conformity to the Litany, [*Remember not our Offences, nor the Offences of our Fore fathers*], and many words of indignation you uſe for my queſtioning it. All this I like very well as to the Cauſe; And I matter it not much how it looks at me: If you *agree* more *angrily* than others diſagree, the *Cauſe* hath ſome advantage by the Agreement. Though me-thinks it argueth ſomewhat unuſual, that ſeeming Diſſenters ſhould cloſe by ſo vehement a Colliſion.

But yet you *will not agree* when you *cannot chuſe but agree*, and you carry it ſtill as if your Allarm had not been given without cauſe: Muſt we *agree*, and not *agree?* What yet is the Matter? Why it is [*a new original ſin*]. My ordinary expreſſions of it,

it may be fully ſeen in the Diſputation: The phraſe you laid hold on in a Preface is cited before, [*That we participate of no guilt, and ſuffer for no original ſin but* Adam's *only*], I denied. And what's the dangerous *Errour* here? That our *nearer Parents* ſin was *Adams*, I may preſume that you hold not. That we are *guilty* of ſuch, you *deny not:* That *it is ſin*, I find you not denying: ſure then all the difference muſt be in the word [ORIGINAL].

And if ſo, you that ſo hardly believe your loud-noiſed diſagreements to be but *verbal*, muſt patiently give me leave here to try it. Is it any more than the *Name* ORIGINAL that you are ſo heinouſly offended at? Sure it is not: Elſe in this Letter purpoſely written about it, you would have told your *Reader what it is*. Suffer me then to ſummon your Allarm'd Juniors to come and ſee what a *Spectrum* it is that muſt affright them; and what a Poppet-Play or dreaming War it is, that the Church is to be engaged in, as if it were a matter of Life and Death? *Audite juvenes!* I took the word [ORIGINAL] in this buſineſs to have ſeveral ſignifications. Firſt, That is called [*ORIGINAL*] *Sin*, which was the *ORIGO* of all other ſins in the Humane World: And that was not *Adam*'s *ſin*, but *Eves*.

2. That which was the *ORIGO* of ſin to all the World, ſave *Adam* and *Eve*, communicated by the way of Generation: And that was *Adams* and *Eves* conjunct, *viz.* 1. Their firſt ſinful Acts; 2. Their Guilt; 3. And their habitual pravity (making it full, though in Nature following the Act). This Sin, Fact, Guilt, and Habit, as Accidents

cidents of the Perſons of *Adam* and *Eve*, are not Accidents of our Perſons.

3. *Our perſonal participation*; 1. *In the guilt* of the ſin of *Adam* and *Eve*; 2. And of a vicious *privation* and *habit* from them, as ſoon as we are Perſons. Which is called *Original* ſin, on three accounts conjunct; 1. Becauſe it is a participation of their *Original Act* that we are guilty of; 2. Becauſe it is in us *ab Origine*, from our *firſt Being*; 3. And becauſe it is the *Origo* of all our *Actual Sins*.

4. I call that alſo [ORIGINAL] (or *part of Original Sin*) which hath but the two later only; *viz.* 1. Which is in us *AB ORIGINE*, from our firſt perſonal being; 2. Which is the *Root* or *ORIGO* in our ſelves of all our *Actual Sins*: And thus our *Guilt* and *Vice* derived from our *nearer Parents*, and not from *Adam*, is our *Original Sin*; That is, 1. Both *Guilt* and *Habit* are in us from our *Original*, or firſt Being; 2. And all our Actual Sin ſpringeth from it as a partial Cauſe: For I may preſume that this Reverend Doctor doth not hold that *Adam*'s ſin derived to us is in one *part* of the *Soul*, (which is not partible) and our nearer *Parent*'s in another; but will grant that it is *one vitioſity* that is derived from both, the latter being a Degree added to the former; though the *Reatus* having more than *one fundamentum*, may be called *diverſe*. That *Origo & Active & paſſive dicitur*, I ſuppoſe we are agreed. Now I call the *vicious Habits* contracted from our nearer Parents by ſpecial reaſon of *their own ſins*, ſuperadded to the degree, which elſe we ſhould have derived from *Adam*,

Adam, a *part* of our *original ſinful Pravity*, even a ſecondary part. And I call our *guilt* of the ſins of our *nearer Parents* (not *Adam*'s) which you will, either a *ſecondary Original Guilt*, or *Sin*, or a ſecondary *part* of our *Original Guilt*. See then our dangerous diſagreement: I call that ORIGINAL, which is in us *ab Origine*, when we are firſt Perſons, and is partly the Root or *Origo* in us of all our following Actual Sin: though it was not the *Original Sin* of *Mankind*, or the firſt of Sins. The Doctor thinks this an Expreſſion, which all *Juniors* muſt be warned to take heed of, and to take heed of the Doctrine of him that uſeth it. The Allarm is againſt this dangerous word [*ORIGINAL*]. And let a Man awake tell us what is the danger.

But I would bring him yet to agreement even *de nomine*, though it anger him. 1. Let him read the *Artic. 9. of the Church of England*, and ſeeing there *Original Sin* is ſaid to be that *corruption of Nature whereby we are far gone from Original Righteouſneſs*, and *are of our own Nature inclined to evil, ſo that the fleſh luſteth againſt the Spirit. The luſt of the fleſh called* φρόνημα σαρκὸς, *which ſome do expound the Wiſdom, ſome Senſuality, ſome the Affection, ſome the deſire of the Fleſh, not ſubject to the Law of God*]: Seing a degree of all this ſame Luſt is in Men from the ſpecial ſins of their Fore-fathers, as well as from *Adam*'s; Is not this Degree here called *Original Sin?* (why the Church omitted the *Imputed Guilt* aforeſaid, I enquire not).

2. If this will not ſerve, if he will find me any Text of Scripture, which uſeth the Phraſe, [*ORIGINAL Sin*], I will promiſe him hereafter to uſe

uſe it in no other ſenſe, than the Scripture uſeth it.

3. If that will not ſerve, if the Maſters of Language will agree, (yea, to paſs by our *Lexicons*, if the Doctors of that Univerſity will give it us under their hands) that the word [ORIGINAL] is unaptly and dangerouſly applyed to that ſinful *Guilt* and *Pravity* which is in us *ab Origine Naſtræ exiſtentiæ*, and is the internal *Radix vel Origo* of all our Actual Sin, in part of Cauſality, I will uſe that Epithete ſo no more.

4. If all this will not ſerve, if he himſelf will give me a *fitter Epithete*, I will uſe it: And now we *over-agree* in Doctrine, a word ſhall not divide us, unleſs he will be angry becauſe we are agreed, as *Jonas* was that the *Ninivites* were ſpared, becauſe it ſeemed to diſgrace his Word.

§. II. *pag.* 4, 5, &c. You invite me to, [*a full entire retractation of my Doctrine of Juſtification* (you add, *By Works*) and the *ſecondary Original Sin*].

1. Will you take it well if I retract that which you profeſs now to hold, and know none that denyeth, then there is no pleaſing you: If I muſt be thought to wrong you for ſeeming to differ from you, and yet muſt retract all: What, yours and all Mens?

2. Do you mean the *words* or the *ſenſe* of *Juſtification* (as you call it) *by Works*? For the words, I take you for a ſubſcriber to the 39 *Articles*; and therefore that you reject not the Epiſtle of St. *James*: And for the *ſenſe*, I confeſs it is a motion ſuitable to the Intereſt of your *Treatiſe*, (though not of the Truth): He that cannot confute the Truth,

would

would more eaſily do his Work, if he could perſwade the Defenders of it to an *Entire Retractation*. Hereupon, *pag.* 5. you recite my words, of the difficulty of bringing ſome Militant Divines to yield: Your Admonition for Self-Application of them is uſeful, and I thank you for it: But is it not a ſtreight that ſuch as I am in, between two contrary ſorts of Accuſers? When Mr. *Danvers*, and Multitudes on that ſide, Reproach me daily for *Retractations*, and *you* for want of them? How natural is it now to Mankind, to deſire to be the Oracles of the World, and that all ſhould be *Silenced*, or *Retracted*, which is againſt their Minds? How many call on me for Retractation? Mr. *Tombes*, and Mr. *Danvers*, for what I have Written for Infants-Baptiſm: The *Papiſts* for what I have Written againſt them: And how many more? And as to what I *have Retracted*, *One* reproached me for it, and another either knoweth not of it, or perſwadeth others that it is not done.

You ſay, *pag.* 6. [*A great out-cry you have made of me, as charging you with things you have Retracted*—— And pag. 7. *What's the reaſon you have not hitherto directed us to the particulars of your Recantation, what, when, where?*—— *You direct one indeed, to a ſmall Book, above Twenty years a-go retracted.*—— *All I can pick up of any ſeeming Retractation*, is that you ſay, *that Works are neceſſary at leaſt to the continuation of our Juſtification.*

Anſw. Either this is Written by *a Wilful*, or a *Heedleſs* miſtaking of my words. The firſt I will not ſuſpect; it muſt therefore be the ſecond, (for I muſt not judg you *Unable* to underſtand plain Engliſh). And is it any wonder if you have

many ſuch Miſtakes in your diſputes of Juſtification, when you are ſo *heedleſs* about a matter of Fact? Where did I ever ſay, that I had *Recanted*? Or that I *Retracted* any of the Doctrine of Juſtification, which I had laid down? Cannot you diſtinguiſh between *Suſpending*, or *Revoking*, or *Retracting* a *particular Book*, for the ſake of ſeveral *Crude and Incongruous* Expreſſions, and Retracting or Recanting *that Doctrine of Juſtification*? Or can you not underſtand words, that plainly thus Diſtinguiſh? Why talk you of *what*, and *when*, and *where*, and conjecture at the *words*, as if you would make the Reader believe, that indeed it is ſome confeſſed Errors of mine, which you Confuted? and that I take it for an Injury, becauſe I Retracted them? And ſo you think you ſalve your Confutation, whatever you do by your Candour and Juſtice: But you have not ſo much as Fig-leaves for either. It was the *Aphoriſms*, or *Book*, that I ſaid was above Twenty years a go Revoked: When in my Treatiſe of Infant-Baptiſm, I had craved Animadverſions on it, and promiſed a better Edition, if I Publiſhed it any more; I forbad the Reptinting it, till I had time to Correct it; and when many called for it, I ſtill deny'd them. And when the *Cambridg* Printer Printed it a ſecond time, he did it by Stealth, pretending it was done beyond Sea. In my *Confeſſion* Twenty years ago, I gave the Reaſons, *Preface*. *pag.* 35. [*I find that there are ſome Incautelous Paſſages in my Aphoriſms, not fitted to their Reading, that come to ſuck Poyſon, and ſeek for a Word to be Matter of Accuſation and Food for their Cenſuring opinionative Zeal.*—— And pag. 42. *If any Brother underſtand not any word in*

my

my Aphorisms which is here Interpreted, or mistake my sense about the Matter of that Book, which is here more fully opened; I must expect, that they interpret that by this. And if any one have so little to do as to write against that Book (which is not unlikely) if he take the Sense contrary to what I have here and else-where since then Published, I shall but neglect him as a Contentious, Vain Wrangler, if not a Calumniator]. I Wrote this sharply, to forwarn the Contentious, not knowing then that above Twenty years after, Dr. *Tully* would be the Man. Pag. 43. [*If any will needs take any thing in this Book to be rather a Retractation, than an Explication, of what I have before said, though I should best know my own Meaning; yet do such commend me, while they seem to blame me: I never look to write that which shall have no need of Correction.*—— And Cap. 1. pag. 2. [*Lest I should prove a further Offence to my Brethren, and a Wrong to the Church, I desired those who thought it worth their Labour, to vouchsafe me their Animadversions, which I have spent much of these Three last years in considering, that I might Correct what-ever was discovered to be Erroneous, and give them an account of my Reasons of the rest. I have not only since* SUPPRESSED *that Book which did offend them, but also laid by those Papers of Universal Redemption, which I had written, lest I should be further offensive,* &c.] In my Apologie else-where I have such like Passages, ever telling Men that [*It was the first Book I wrote in my Unexperienced Youth; that I take the Doctrines of it to be sound and needful, save that in divers places they are unskilfully and incautelously worded.* (As the Word [*Covenant*] is oft put for [*Law,*] &c.) And that

I wrote my *Confession*, and *Disputes* of *Justification*, as an Expolition of it; and that I *Retracted*, or *Suspended*, or *Revoked*, not the *Doctrine*, but the *Book*, till I had Corrected it, and did disown it as too unmeet an Expreſſion of my Mind, which I had more fully expreſt in other *Books*.

And is not this plain Engliſh? Doth this warrant a *Wiſe* and *Righteous* Man, to intimate that I accuſe him of writing againſt that Doctrine of Juſtification which I *Recanted*, and to call for the *What*, and *Where*, and *When?* Yea, and tell me, that I [*refer you to a ſmall Book*] when inſtead of *referring* you to it, I only blame you for referring to that alone, when I had ſaid as before?

When many Divines have publiſhed the firſt Edition of their Works imperfectly, and greatly corrected and enlarged them in a Second (as *Beza* his *Annotations*, *Polanus* his *Syntagma*, and many ſuch) all Men take it for an Injury for a Neighbour twenty years after, to ſelect the firſt Edition to confute as the Author's Judgment: Much more might I, when I publiſhed to the World, that I *Suſpended the whole Book*, and *have theſe twenty* four years hindred the Printing of it; profeſſing that I have in many larger Books, more intelligibly and fully opened the ſame things.

Yea, you fear not *pag.* 23. to ſay, That I tell you of *about* 60 *Books* of *Retractations*, in *part at leaſt which I have Written*]; when never ſuch a word fell from me. If I ſay, The one that hath publiſhed his *Suſpenſion* of a *ſmall Book* written in *Youth*, not for the *Doctrine of it*, but *ſome unfit* Expreſſions, and hath ſince in al-moſt thirty Years time, written about ſixty Books, in many or moſt

moſt of which is ſomewhat of the ſame Subject, and in ſome of them he fullier openeth his Mind; ſhould be dealt with by an Adverſary, according to ſome of his later and larger Explications, and not according to the Mode and Wording of that one Suſpended Book alone: Shall ſuch a Man as you ſay, that I [*tel you of about ſixty Books of Retractations*]? Or will it not abate Mens reverence of your diſputing Accurateneſs, to find you ſo untruſty in the Recitation of a Man's words? The truth is, it is this great Defect of *Heed* and *Accurateneſs*, by haſty Temerity, which alſo ſpoileth your Diſputations.

But, *pag.* 7. the Aphoriſms muſt be, [*The moſt Schollar-like, and Elaborate (though Erroneous) Book in Controverſie, you ever Compoſed*]. Anſw. 1. Your Memory is faulty: Why ſay you in the next, that I *appeal* to my Diſputation of Juſtification and *ſome others*; *but you cannot Trudg up and down, to every place I would ſend you, your Legs are too weak?* Either you had read all the ſixty Books which you mention (the Controverſal at leaſt) or not: If *not*, How can you tell that the Aphoriſms is the moſt *Elaborate*? If *yes*, Why do you excuſe your Trudging, and why would you ſelect a Suſpended Book, and touch none that were Written at large on the ſame Subject? 2. By this (I ſuppoſe to make your Nibble to ſeem a Triumph) you tell your Reader again, how to value your Judgment. Is it like that any Dunce that is diligent, ſhould Write no more *Schollar-like* at Sixty years of Age than at Thirty? And do you think you know better what of mine is *Elaborate*, than I do? Sure that Word might have been ſpared;

When I know that one printed Leaf of Paper hath cost me more Labour than all that Book, and perhaps one Scheme of the Distinctions of Justification, which you deride. If indeed you are a competent Judg of your own Writings, Experience assureth me, that you are not so of mine. And *pag.* 25. you say, You *desire not to be preferred before your Betters, least of all when you are singular*; as here I think you are.

§. III. Pag. 9. You are *offended* for being *put in the Cub, with divers mean and contemptible Malefactors.*]

Answ. O for Justice! 1. Was not *Bellarmin*, or some of the *Papists* and the *Socinians*, as great Malefactors, with whom (as you phrase it) you put me in the Cub? 2. Are *they Malefactors* so far as they *agree with you in Doctrine*, and are *you Innocent?* What is the Difference between *your Treatise*, in the part that toucheth me, and that of Mr. *Eyres*, Mr. *Crandon*, and some others such? Dr. *Owen*, and Dr. *Kendale*, indeed differed from you; the latter seeking (by Bishop *Usher*) an amicable Closure, and the former (if I understand his Book on the *Hebrews*) less differing from me in Doctrine, than once he either did, or seemed to do. (And if any of us all grow no Wiser in thirty years Study, we may be ashamed). But to give you your due Honour, I will name you with your Equals, as far as I can judg, *viz.* *Maccovius*, *Cluto*, *Coccejus*, and *Cloppenburgius*, (I mean but in the Point in Question; it's no Dishonour to you to give some of them Precedencie in other things). It may be also *Spanhemius*, was near you. But

(if

(if I may preſume to liken my Betters) no Men ſeem to me to have been ſo like you, as *Guilielmus Rivet*, (not *Andrew*), Mr. *George Walker*, and Mr. *Roborough*. (I hope this Company is no Diſhonour to you). And very unlike you are *Le Blanc*, *Camero*, *Davenant*, Dr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Gataker*, Mr. *Anthony Wotton*, and in Complexion *Scotus* and *Ockam*, and ſuch as they: If yet I have not Choſen you pleaſing Company, I pray you choo ſe fo your ſelf.

But you ſay on, [*Had you not* (*in your Memory many Scores of greateſt Eminence and Repute in the Chriſtian World, of the ſame Judgment with me*—— *Know you not, I ſpeak the ſame thing with all the Reformed Churches*, &c.—— *For ſhame let it be the Church of* England, *with all the reſt of the Reformed*, &c.]

Anſw. 1. I know not what you hold, even when I read what you write: (I muſt hope as well as I can, that you know your ſelf): How then ſhould I know who are *of the ſame Judgment* with you?

2. Yet I am very confident, that all they whom you mention, are of the ſame in ſome thing or other; and in particular, that we are *Juſtified by Faith, and not by the Works of the Law, or any Works in the ſence denied by St.* Paul, *&c.*

3. Do not I, with as great Confidence as you, lay Claim to the ſame Company and Concord? And if one of us be miſtaken, muſt your bare Word determine which it is? Which of us hath brought the fuller Proofs? I ſubſcribe to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as well as you; and my Condition theſe thirteen or fourteen years, giveth

as much Evidence, that I am loth to ſubſcribe to what I believe not, as yours doth of you. And you that know which of my Books is the moſt Elaborate, ſure know, that in that Book which I Wrote to explain thoſe Aphoriſms (called my *Confeſſion*) I cite the Words of *above an Hundred Proteſtant Witneſſes*, that give as much to *Works* as I do: And that of this Hundred, one is the *Auguſtine* Confeſſion, one the *Weſtminſter* Synod, one the Synod of *Dort*, one the Church of *England*, each one of which being Collectives, contain many. (And here I tell you of more). And have you brought *more* Witneſſes? Or *any* to the contrary? Did you *Confute*, or once *take Notice* of any of theſe?

4. Do you not here before yon are aware, let your Reader know that it was, and ſtill is, in the Dark, that you Alarm the World about our *dangerous Differences*, and run to your Arms undreſt, before your Eyes are open? *Qui conveniunt in aliquo tertio*, &c. They that agree with the Church of *England*, in the Doctrine of Juſtification by Faith, do ſo far agree between themſelves: But Dr. *Tullie*, and *R. B.* do agree with the Church of *England*, in the Doctrine of Juſtification by Faith. *Ergo.*—— The Article referreth to the Homilies, where it is more fully Explained.

5. May not I then retort your Argument, and bid you [*For ſhame let it be no longer* Bellarmine, *and* R. B. *but the Church of* England, *and all the Reformed, and* R. B.]? Diſprove the Witneſſes twenty years ago, produced by me in this very Cauſe; or elſe ſpeak out, and ſay, [*The Church of* England, *and the reſt of the Reformed, hold Juſtification by Works*,

Works, just as Bellarmine *and the Papists do*] which is it which you would fasten on me, who agree with them (as if you had never there read my Answer to Mr. *Crandon*, objecting the same thing).

§. IV. Your Censure, *pag.* 10, 11. of my *Windings*, *Clouds* of *Novel Distinctions*, *Preambles*, *Limitations*, &c. is just such as your Treatise did bid me expect: Till you become guilty of the same Crime, and fall out with *Confusion*, and take not equivocal ambiguous Words unexplained, instead of Univocals, in the stating of your Questions, I shall never the more believe that *Hannibal* is at the Gates, or the City on Fire, for your Allarms.

§. V. *Pag.* 11. Where you tell me, that [*You have no Profit by my Preface:* I shall not deny it, nor wonder at it; you are the fittest Judge: Where you say, that [*I have no Credit,*] You do but tell the World at what Rates you write. *Honor est in honorante.* And have all my Readers already told you their Judgment? Alas! How few? In all *London*, not a Man hath yet given me Notice of his Dislike, or Dissent. And sure your *own Pen* is a good Confuter of you. It is *some Credit*, that such a Man as you, is forced to profess a *full Consent* to the Doctrine, though with passionate Indignation.

You tell me of [*Nothing to the Question*]. But will you not be angry if I should but tell you, how little you did to *state* any Question, and in Reason must be supposed, when you assaulted my Doctrine,

Doctrine, to take it *as I ſtated it*; which I have fully ſhewed you?

You tell me, that *You Charged me only with new Original Sin, underived from* Adam, *unknown, unheard of before, in the Chriſtian World.*

Anſw. De re, is not our Guilt of nearer Parent's Sins ſuch which you and all that you know (now at laſt) confeſs? *De nomine*, 1. Tell the World if you can, when I called it [*New Original Sin, or underived from* Adam, *or unknown, or unheard of*]. There are more ways than one of Derivation from *Adam*. It is not derived from him by ſuch *Imputation* as his firſt Sin; but it is derived from him as a *partial Cauſa Cauſæ*, by many Gradations. All Sin is ſome-way from him. Either you mean that *I ſaid, that it was not Derived from* Adam, or you gather it by ſome Conſequence from what I ſaid. If the Firſt, ſhew the Words, and the Shame ſhall be mine. If not, you know the old Law, that to falſe Accuſers, it muſt be done as they would have done to the Accuſed. But if it be your *Conſequence*, prove it, and tell the World, what are the Premiſes that infer it.

§. VI. *Pag.* 12. You friendly help me to *profit by my ſelf*, however you profeſs that *you profit not* by me! What I have ſaid to you againſt [*Haſty Judging*], I have firſt ſaid to my ſelf, and the more you warn me of it, the more friendly you are: If it be not againſt ſuch as you but *my ſelf*, it is againſt my ſelf that I have a Treatiſe on that Subject; but I begin to think my ſelf in this more *Seeing* than you; for I *ſee it both in my ſelf and you*, and *you* ſeem to ſee it in *me*, and *not in*

your

your ſelf. But with all Men, I find, that to ſee the Spots in our own Face immediately is hard, and to love the Glaſs which ſheweth them, is not eaſie; eſpecially to ſome Men that neither are low, nor can endure to be ſo, till there is no Remedy.

But, Sir, how eaſie a Way of Diſputing have you happily light on, Who inſtead of Examining the hundred Witneſſes which I brought, and my elſe-where oft proving the Doctrine oppoſed by me to be *Novel, and Singular*, do in few words talk of your *holding the Doctrine delivered to the Saints*, and of the *many Worthies that concur with you*, and of my *pelting at their Heads, and draging them by the Hoary-heads, as a Spectacle and By-word to all*, (by proving their conſent by expreſs Citations) *what Armies, and of what Strength appear againſt me, whoſe Names I defie and wound, through yours?*

Anſw. And is not he a weak Man that cannot talk thus upon almoſt any Subject? But who be theſe Men, and what *be* their Names? Or rather, firſt, rub your Eyes, and tell us what is the *Controverſie? Tully* ſometimes talkt at this rate in his Orations, but verily much better in his Philoſophy.

And you ſee no cauſe to repent, but you *bleſs God that you can again and again call to all Youth, that as they love the Knowledg of Truth, they take me not for an Oracle in my bold dividing Singularities*].

Anſw. That the Name of *Truth* is thus abuſed, is no News; I would the Name of God were not: And I am ſorry, that *you ſee no Cauſe to repent.* I am obliged to love you the better, for being againſt

against *dividing Singularities* in the general *Notion*; I hope if you *knew* it, you would not be *for them*, as in *singular Existents*. But sure, none at *Oxford* are in danger of taking me for *an Oracle?* This is another needless Work. So *Spanhemius* took that for a Singularity, which *Dallæus* in a large Catalogue, hath proved the Common Judgment of the Church, till Contention of late caused some Dissenters.

Will you cease these empty general Ostentations, and choose out any one Point of real Difference between you and me about Justification, and come to a fair Trial, on whose side the Churches of Christ have been for 1500 years after Christ; yea, bring me but any two or one considerable Person, that was for a thousand years for your Cause against mine, and I will say, that you have done more to confute me by far, than yet you have done; and if *two only* be against me, I will pardon you for calling me Singular.

§. VII. *Pag.* 13, 14, 15. You again do keep up the *Dividing Fear*, are offended that I perswade you, that by *Melancholy Phantasms you set not the Churches together by the Ears, and make People believe that they differ, where they do not:* And you ask, *Who began the Fray?*

Answ. 1. Do you mean that I began with *you?* You do not sure: But is it that I *began with the Churches*, and you were *necessitated to defend* them? Yes, if *Gallus*, *Ambsdorfius*, *Schlusselburgius*, and Dr. *Crisp*e, and his Followers, be the Church? But, Sir, I provoke you to try it by the just Testimony of Antiquity, *who began to differ from the Churches.*

In

In this Treatiſe I have given you ſome Account, and *Voſſius* hath given you more. which you can never anſwer: But if my Doctrine put you upon this Neceſſity, what hindred you from perceiving it theſe twenty years and more, till now? O Sir, had you *no other work* to do, but to Vindicate the Church and Truth? I doubt you had.

§. VIII. But *pag.* 15. You are again incredulous, that [*All the Difference betwixt you and me, or others of the ſame Judgment in the Point of Juſtification, is meerly Verbal; and that in the Main we are agreed*]. And again you complain of your *weak Legs*.

Anſw. 1. I do agree with very many againſt *their wills in Judgment* (becauſe the *Judgment* may be *conſtrained*), but with none in *Affection*, as on their part. Did I ever ſay, that *I differed not from you?* I tell you, I know not what your Judgment is, nor know I *who is* of your Mind? But I have not barely *ſaid*, but oft proved, that (though not the *Antinomians*) the *Proteſtants* are moſtly here agreed in the Main. If you could not have time to read my larger Proof, that ſhort Epiſtle to Mr. *Allen's* Book of the Covenant, in which I proved it, might have ſtopt your Mouth from calling for more Proof, till you had better confuted what was given.

But you ſay, [*Are perfect Contradictions no more than a difference in Words? Faith alone, and not Faith alone? Faith with and without Works? Excuſe our Dulneſs here*].

Anſw. 1. Truly, Sir, it is a tedious thing, when a Man hath over and over Anſwered ſuch Ob-

Objections; yea, when the full Answers have been twenty years in Print, to be put still to say over all again, to every Man that will come in and say, that *his Legs* are *too weak* to go see what was answered before: How many score times then, or hundreds, may I be called to repeat.

2. If I must pardon your *Dulness*, you must pardon my *Christianity* (or chuse) who believe that there is no such [*perfect Contradictions*] between Christ's, [*By thy Words thou shalt be Justified*] and *Paul's*, [*Justified by Faith, without the Works of the Law*] or [*not of Works*]; and *James's* [*We are justified by Works, and not by Faith only*]. Must we needs proclaim *War* here, or cry out, *Heresie*, or *Popery?* Are not all these Reconcileable? Yea, and *Pauls* too, *Rom.* 2. *The Doers of the Law shall be justified.*

3. But did I ever deny that it is [*by Faith alone and without Works*]? Where, and when? But may it not be, *by Faith alone* in one sense, and not *by Faith alone* in another sense?

4. But even where you are speaking of it, you cannot be drawn to distinguish of *Verbal* and *Real Differences.* Is it here the *Words*, or *Sense*, which you accuse? The *Words* you dare not deny to be *Gods own* in Scripture, spoken by *Christ*, *Paul*, and *James.* My *Sense* I have opened to you at large, and you take no Notice of it; but as if you abhorred *Explication* and *Distinction*, speak still against the *Scripture Words.*

§. IX. *Pag.* 16. But you say, [*Let any discerning Reader compare the* 48 §. *of this Preface with the Words* in pag. 5. *of your Appeal to the Light,*

and

and 'tis likely he will concur with me, in that *Melancholy Phantaſm*, or *Fear*: For *'tis worth the noting, how in that dark Appeal where you diſtinguiſh of Popiſh Points*, i. e. *ſome-where the Difference is reconcileable, others in effect but in words; we have no Direction upon which Rank we muſt beſtow Juſtification, nothing of it at all from you, Name or Thing: But why, next to the All-ſeeing God, you ſhould know beſt your ſelf*].

Anſw. Alas, Sir, that *God* ſhould be in ſuch a manner mentioned! I anſwered this ſame Caſe at large in my Confeſſion, Apologie, Diſpute of Juſtification, *&c.* Twenty years ago, or near; I have at large Opened it in a Folio (*Cathol. Theol.*) which you ſaw, yea, in the *very* part which you take Notice of; and now you publiſh it [*worth the Noting, that I did not alſo in one ſheet of Paper*, Printed the other day againſt a Calumnie of ſome Sectarian Hearers, who gave me no Occaſion for ſuch a work. Had it not been a Vanity of me, Should I in that ſheet again have repeated, how I and the Papiſts differ about Juſtification? Were you bound to have read it in that ſheet, any more than in many former Volumns? It's no matter for me; But I ſeriouſly beſeech you, be hereafter more ſober and juſt, than to deal with your Brethren, the Church and Truth, in ſuch a manner as this! But by this Talk I ſuſpect, that you will accuſe me more for opening no more of the Difference in this Book. But, 1. It is enough for to open *my own Meaning*, and I am not obliged to open other Mens: And my own I have opened by ſo many Repetitions, in ſo many Books, as nothing but ſuch Mens *Importunity and obſtructed* Minds, could have Excuſed.

2. The

2. The Papiſts minds ſure, may be better known by their own Writings, than by mine: The Council of *Trent*, telleth it you: What need I recite it? 3. I tell you again, as I did in my Confeſſion, that I had rather all the Papiſts in the World agreed with us, than diſagreed: I like a Doctrine the *better*, and not the worſe, becauſe all the Chriſtian World conſenteth to it. I am not ambitious to have a *Religion to my ſelf*, which a Papiſt doth not own. Where they differ, I am ſorry for it: And it pleaſeth me better, to find in any Point that we are agreed, than that we differ. Neither you, nor any ſuch as you, by crying [*O Papiſh! Antichriſtian!*] ſhall tempt me to do by the Papiſts, as the *Dominicans*, and *Janſeniſts*, and ſome *Oratorians*, do by the *Calviniſts:* I will not with *Alvarez*, *Arnoldus*, *Gibieuf*, &c. make the World believe, that my Adverſaries are much further from me than they are, for fear of being cenſured by Faction, to be one of them. If I would have been of a Church-Faction, and ſold my Soul to pleaſe a Party, I would have begun before now, and taken a bigger Price for it, than you can offer me if you would.

Pag. 17. You ſay, [*Pile one Diſtinction or Evaſion on another, as long as you pleaſe, as many ſeveral Faiths, and Works, and Juſtifications, as you can name, all this will never make two Poles meet*].

Anſw. And do you cry out for *War* in the Darkneſs of Confuſion, as long as you will, you ſhall never tempt me by it to renounce my Baptiſm, and Liſt my ſelf under the grand Enemy of *Love and Concord*, nor to Preach up *Hatred* and *Diviſion* for

for nothing, as in the Name of Christ. If you will handle such Controversies, without *Distinguishing* of *Faiths*, *Works*, and *Justifications*, I will never perswade any Friend of mine to be your Pupil, or Disciple. Then *Simon Magus*'s faith, and the Devils *faith*, and *Peters* faith must all pass for the same, and justifie accordingly. Then indeed, Believing in God the Father, and the Holy Ghost, yea, and Christ, as our Teacher, King and Judg, &c. must pass for the *Works* by which no Man is Justified! If *Distinction* be *unsound*, detect the Error of it: If not, it is no Honour to a disputing Doctor to reproach it.

§. X. But *pag.*17. you set upon your great *undeceiving* Work, to shew the evil of *ill using Words*: [*Words* (you say) *as they are enfranchised into Language, are but the Agents and Factors of things, for which they continually negotiate with our Minds, conveying Errands on all occasions*, &c. (Let them mark, that charge the vanity and bombast of Metaphors on others, one word [*Signa*] should have served our turn instead of all this). [*Whence it follows, that their use and signification is Unalterable, but by the stamp of the like publick usage and imposition from whence at first they received their being*, &c.]

Answ. O Juniors, Will not such deceiving Words save you from my Deceits? But, 1. Is there a *Law*, and unalterable Law for the sense of Words? Indeed, the Words of the sacred Text must have no new Sense put upon them. 2. Are you sure that it was *Publick usage*, and *Imposition from* whence they first received their being? How shall we know

 that

that they grew not into publick uſe from one Mans firſt Invention, except thoſe that (not *Publick uſe*, but) *God Himſelf* made? 3. Are you ſure that all or moſt Words now, *Latine* or *Engliſh*, have the ſame, and only the ſame uſe or ſenſe, as was put upon them at the firſt? Is the change of the ſenſe of Words a ſtrange thing to us? 4. But that which concerneth our Caſe moſt, is, Whether there be many Words either of *Hebrew* and *Greek* in the Scripture, or of *Latine*, *Engliſh*, or any common Language, which have not *many Significations?* Your Reputation forbids you to deny it. And ſhould not thoſe many Significations be diſtinguiſhed as there is Cauſe? Are not *Faith*, *Works*, *Juſt*, *Juſtice*, *Juſtification*, words of divers ſenſes in the Scripture? and do not common Writers and Speakers uſe them yet more variouſly? And ſhall a Diſputer take on him, that the *uſe* or *ſignification* of each is but *one*, or *two*, or is ſo *fixed* that there needeth no diſtinction? 5. Is the change that is made in all Languages in the World, made by the ſame publick uſage and impoſition, from which at firſt they received their being? 6. If (as you ſay) the *ſame thing can be repreſented by different words, only when they are Synonymous*, ſhould we not avoid ſeeming to repreſent the ſame by *Equivocals*, which unexplained are unfit for it?

Pag. 20. You tell me what *ſad work* you are doing; and no wonder, Sin and Paſſions are ſelf-troubling things: And it's well if it be ſad to your ſelf alone, and not to ſuch as you tempt into Miſtakes, Hatred, and Diviſion. It ſhould be ſad to every Chriſtian, to ſee and hear thoſe whom they are

are bound to Love, represented as *odious*: And you are still, *pag.* 19. feigning, that [*Every eye may see Men dealing Blows and Deaths about, and therefore we are not wise if we think them agreed.*

But *doubtless*, many that seem killed by such Blows as some of yours, are still alive? And many a one is in Heaven, that by Divines pretending to be Orthodox, were damned on Earth! And many Men are more agreed than they were aware of. I have known a Knavish Fellow set two Persons of quality on Fighting, before they spake a word to one another, by telling them secretly and falsly what one said against the other. Many differ, even to persecuting and bloodshed, by *Will* and *Passion* and *Practice*, upon a falsly supposed great *difference in Judgment*. I will not so suddenly repeat what Proof I have given of some of this in the place you noted, *Cath. Theol. Confer.* 11, 12, & 13. There is more skill required to *narrow* differences, than to *widen* them; and to *reconcile*, than to *divide*; as there is to *quench* a Fire, than to *kindle* it; to *build*, than to *pull down*; to *heal*, than to *wound*.

I presume therefore to repeat aloud my contrary Cautions to your Juniors.

Young-Men, after long sad Experience of the sinful and miserable Contentions of the Clergie, and consequently of the Christian World, that you may escape the Guilt, I beseech you, whoever contradicteth it, consider and believe these following Notices:

1. *That all Words are but arbitrary Signs, and are changed as Men please; and through the Penury of them, and Mans imperfection in the Art of Speaking,*

ing, there are very few at all, that have not various Significations.

2. *That this Speaking-Art requireth so much time and study, and all Men are so defective in it, and the variety of Mens skill in it is so very great, that no Men in the World do perfectly agree in their interpretation and use of Words.* The doleful plague of the Confusion of Tongues, doth still hinder our full Communication, and maketh it hard for us to understand Words our selves, or to be understood by others; for *Words* must have a three-fold aptitude of Signification. 1. To *signifie* the *Matter*, 2. And the *Speakers conceptions* of it. 3. And this as adapted to the hearers Mind, to make a true Impression there.

3. That God in Mercy hath not made *Words* so necessary as *Things*, nor necessary but for the sake of the *Things*: If *God*, *Christ*, *Grace*, and *Heaven*, be known, believed, and duly accepted, you shall be saved by what Words soever it be brought to pass.

4. Therefore *Real Fundamentals*, or *Necessaries to Salvation*, are more easily defined than *Verbal ones*: For *more* or *fewer* Words, *these* or *other* Words are needful to help *some* Persons, to Faith, and *Love*, and *Holiness*, as their Capacities are different.

5. But as he that truly *believeth in*, and *giveth up* himself to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the sense of the Baptismal Covenant, is a true Christian, to be loved, and shall be saved; so he that understandeth *such Words*, as help him to that true *Faith* and *Consent*, doth know so much of the *Verbal part*, as is of necessity

ceſſity to his Chriſtianity and Salvation.

6. *And he that is ſuch, holdeth no Hereſie or Error inconſiſtent with it: If he truly love God, it's a contradiction to ſay, that he holdeth an Error inconſiſtent with the Love of God.*

7. *Therefore ſee that you Love all ſuch as Chriſtians, till ſome proved or notorious inconſiſtents nullifying his Profeſſion diſoblige you.*

8. *Take your ſelves to be neither of Roman, or any other Church as Univerſal, which is leſs than the Univerſality of all Chriſtians headed by Chriſt alone.*

9. *Make this Love of all Chriſtians the ſecond part of your Religion, and the Love of God, of Chriſt, of Holineſs and Heaven, the firſt; and live thus in the ſerious practice of your Covenant, even of Simple Chriſtianity: For it's this that will be your Peace, in Life and at Death.*

10. *And if Men of various degrees of Learning* (or Speaking-skill) *and of various degrees of Holineſs, Humility, and Love, ſhall quarrel about* Words, *and forms of* Speech, *and ſhall hereticate, and revile, and damn each other, while the Eſſentials are held faſt and practiſed, diſcern Right from Wrong as well as you can; but take heed that none of them make* Words *a* ſnare, *to draw you injuriouſly to think hatefully of your Brother, or to divide the Churches, or Servants of Chriſt: And ſuſpect ſuch a Snare becauſe of the great ambiguity of Words, and imperfection of Mans Skill and Honeſty in all Matters of debate: And never diſpute ſeriouſly, without firſt agreeing of the Senſe of every doubtful term with him that you Diſpute with*].

Dr. *Tully*'s Allarm, and other Mens militant Courſe, perſwaded me as a Preſervative, to commend this Counſel to you.

§. XI. *Pag.* 19. You next very juſtly commend *Method*, *ordering*, and *expreſſing* our *Conceptions*, *of which* (you ſay) *I ſeem to make little account in Compariſon*].

Anſw. 1. Had you ſaid, that I had been unhappy in my Endeavours, your Authority might have gone for Proof with many: But you could ſcarce have ſpoken a more incredible word of *me*, than that I ſeem to make little account of Method, I look for no ſharper Cenſure from the Theological Tribe, than that I *Over-do in my Endeavours after Method*. You ſhall not tempt me here unſeaſonably, to anticipate what Evidence I have to produce for my acquittance from this Accuſation.

2. But yet I will ſtill ſay, that it is not ſo neceſſary either to Salvation, or to the Churches Peace, that we all agree in *Methods and Expreſſions*, as that we agree in the hearty reception of Chriſt, and obedience to His Commands? So much Method all muſt know, as to know the *Beginning* and the *End*, from the *Effects* and *Means*, God from the Creature, and as our true conſent to the Baptiſmal Covenant doth require; and I will thankfully uſe all the help which you give me to go further: But I never yet ſaw that Scheme of Theologie, or of any of its Heads, which was any whit large, (and I have ſeen many) which was ſo exact in *Order*, as that it was dangerous in any thing to forſake it. But I cannot think meet to talk much of *Method*, with a Man that talketh as you do

do of *Diſtinguiſhing*, and handleth the Doctrine of Juſtification no more Methodically than you do.

§. XII. But *pag.* 19. you inſtance in the difference between Proteſtants and Papiſts, about the *Neceſſity of Good works, which is wide in reſpect of the placing or ranking of them*, viz. *The one ſtretching it to the firſt Juſtification, the other not, but confining it to its proper rank and province of Inherent Holineſs, where it ought to keep*].

Anſw. Wonderful! Have you that have ſo loudly called to me to tell how I differ about Juſtification, brought your own, and as you ſay, the Proteſtants difference to this? Will none of your Readers ſee now, who cometh nearer them, you or I?

1. Is this diſtinction our proof of your accurateneſs in *Method*, and *Order*, and *Expreſſion*? What meaneth a diſtinction between [*Firſt-Juſtification,*] and [*Inherent Holineſs*]? Do you difference them *Quoad ordinem*, as *Firſt* and *Second*? But here is no *Second* mentioned: Is it in the nature of the things [*Juſtification*, and *Inherent Holineſs*]? What ſignifieth the [*Firſt*] then? But Sir, how many Readers do you expect who know not, 1. That it is not to the *Firſt Juſtification* at all, but to that which they call the *Second* or *Increaſe*, that the Church of *Rome* aſſerteth the neceſſity or uſe of Mans meritorious *Works*? See what I have fully cited out of them for this, *Cath. Theol. Lib.* 2. *Confer.* 13. *pag.* 267. *&c.* ſaving that ſome of them are for ſuch *Preparatives* as ſome call *Merit of Congruity*, and as our Engliſh

Divines do constantly preach for, and the Synod of *Dort* at large assert; though they disown the *name of Merit*, as many of the *Papists* do. They ordinarily say with *Austine*, *Bona opera sequuntur Justificatum, non præcedunt Justificandum.*

2. But, I hope, the word [*First*] here overslipt your Pen, instead of [*Second*]: But suppose it did so: What's the difference between *the Papists first* or *second Justification*, and the *Protestants Inherent Holiness?* None that ever I heard or read of: Who knoweth not that the *Papists* take *Justification* for *Inherent Holiness?* And is this the great difference between *Papists* and *Protestants*, which I am so loudly accused for not acknowledging? viz. *The Papists place Good-Works before Justification*, that is, *Inherent Holiness*; and the *Protestants more rightly place them before Inherent Holiness?* Are you serious, or do you prevaricate?

The *Papists* and *Protestants* hold, that there are some *Duties and common Grace*, usually *preparatory* to Conversion (or Sanctification); which some *Papists (de nomine)* call *Merit* of *Congruity*, and some will not. The *Papists* and *Protestants* say, that *Faith* is in order of nature, at least, before that *Habitual Love*, which is called *Holiness*, and before the *Works thereof.* The *Papists* and *Protestants* say, that *Works of Love* and *Obedience*, follow our First Sanctification, and make up but the *Second part of it*, which consisteth in the *Works of Holiness.* If you speak not of *Works* in the same sense in each part of your Assignation, the Equivocation would be too gross, *viz.* If you should mean [*Papists rank* the *necessity of preparatory Common Works*, or the *Internal act of Faith, or Love, stretching it*

to

to the First Justification; and *Protestants rank other Works*, viz. *The fruits* of *Faith* and *Love*, with *Inherent Holiness*. All agree, 1. That *Common Works go* before *Sanctification*. 2. That Internal Love, and other Grace, do *constitute* Sanctification in the First part of it. 3. That *Special Works* proceeding from *Inward Grace*, are the effects of the First *Part*, and the constitutive Causes of the Second Part of Sanctification; as the word extendeth also to *Holiness of Life:* And whilst *Papists* take *Justification* for *Sanctification*, in all this there is *De re* no difference. (But your accurate Explications by such terms, as [*Stretching*, *Confirming*, *Province*, &c.] are fitter for *Tully*, than for *Aristotle*).

And is this it in the Application that your Zeal will warn Men of, that we must in this take heed of joyning with the *Papists?* Do you mean [*Rank Good-Works with Inherent Holiness*, and not with *the First Sanctification*, and *you then* do *widely differ from the Papists*]? Will not your Reader say, 1. What doth *Inherent Holiness differ from* the First *Sanctification?* 2. *Do you not invite* me *thus herein to be a Papist*, when they rank them no where but, as you say, the *Protestants* do? 3. Do not you here proclaim, that *Papists* and *Protestants* differ not about the necessity of Good-works to Justification? But yet I that would make no Differences wider than they are, can find some greater than you have mentioned.

Truly Sir, I am grieved and ashamed, to foresee how Learned *Papists* will make merry with such Passages; and say, *See here how we differ from the Protestants! See what it is for*, that the *Protestant*

ſtant Doctors ſeparate from the Church of Rome! viz. *Becauſe we make Good-Works neceſſary to the Firſt Juſtification, which unleſs equivocally ſpoken, is falſe; and becauſe the Proteſtants rank them with Inherent Holineſs, as we do*]. What greater advantage will they deſire againſt us, than to chooſe us ſuch Advocates? And to ſhew the World that even where their keeneſt Adverſaries condemn them, and draw Men from them, they do but juſtifie them? Who knoweth what a Temptation they may make of ſuch paſſages to draw any to Popery? It is my aſſurance, that ſuch *Over-doing*, is *Undoing*; and that miſtaken Accuſations of the *Papiſts* greatly advantage them againſt us, which maketh me the more againſt ſuch Dealing; beſides the *ſinfulneſs*, of pretending that any differences among Chriſtians, are greater than indeed they are.

But may not I think that you take the word [*Juſtification*] here in the *Proteſtant Senſe*, and not in the *Papiſts*, when you ſay that they *rank Good-work's-neceſſity as ſtretcht to the Firſt Juſtification?* No ſure: For, 1. Proteſtants uſe not to diſtingniſh of a *Firſt* and *Second* Juſtification, which Papiſts do, but of Juſtification as *Begun, Continued, and Conſummate*. 2. If it were ſo, it were not true: For the Firſt *Juſtification* in the Proteſtant Senſe, is our *firſt right* to *Impunity* and *Life Eternal, freely given to Believers, for the Merits of Chriſts perfect Righteouſneſs and Satisfaction*. And Papiſts do not make *Good-works* (unleſs Equivocally ſo called) neceſſary to this; but as a Fruit to follow it.

As

As for *Remiſſion of Sin*, I have elſe-where proved, 1. That moſt commonly by that word the Papiſts mean nothing, but that which we call *Mortification*, or Putting away, or deſtroying the Sin it ſelf, as to the habit and ceaſing the Act. 2. That moſt of them are not reſolved, where the *Remiſſion* of the *Puniſhment* (which Proteſtants call *Remiſſion of Sin*, or *Forgiveneſs*) ſhall be placed: They differ not much as to its *Time*, but whether it be to be called any *part of Juſtification*: Some ſay, yea; ſome make it a *diſtinct thing*. Moſt deſcribe *Juſtification* by it ſelf, as conſiſting in our *Remiſſion* of, or Deliverance from Sin it ſelf, and the infuſed habit of Love or Righteouſneſs (all which we call Sanctification), and the *forgiveneſs of the Penalty* by it ſelf, not medling with the Queſtion, whether the latter be any part of the former; ſo much are they at a loſs in the Notional part among themſelves. But they (and we) diſtinguiſh of *Forgiveneſs*, as we diſtinguiſh of Penalties: We have a right to Impunity as to everlaſting Damnation, upon our firſt being Juſtified; but our Right becometh afterward more *full*, and many other Penalties are after to be remitted.

§. XIII. *Pag.* 20. In my 42. *Direct.* for the Cure of Church-diviſions, telling the Weak whom they muſt follow, I concluded, 1. *That the neceſſary Articles of Faith muſt be made our own, and not taken meerly on the authority of any; and we muſt in all ſuch things of abſolute neceſſity keep company with the Univerſal Church.* 2. *That in Matters of Peace and Concord the greater part muſt be our Guide.* 3. *That in Matters of humane Obedience,*

our

our Governours muſt be our Guides. And, 4. *In Matters of high and difficult Speculation, the judgment of one Man of extraordinary Underſtanding and Clearneſs, is to be preferred before the Rulers and the major Vote. I inſtanced in Law, Philoſophy, Phyſick, Languages*, &c. *and in the Controverſies of the Object of Predeſtination, the nature of the Will's Liberty, Divine Concourſe, the determining way of Grace, of the definition of Juſtification, Faith*, &c.] Here I was *intreated before God and my Conſcience, to ſearch my ſelf, with what Deſign or Intent I wrote this*, and to tell you, *Who that One is, that we may know whom to prefer, and to whom, in the Doctrine of Juſtification*, &c.

Anſw. How greatly do you diſhonour your ſelf, (and then you will impute it to me) by inſiſting on ſuch palpably abuſive Paſſages? Had you not been better, have ſilently paſt it by? 1. Doth not the World know, that Heathens and Chriſtians, Papiſts and Proteſtants, are Agreed on this general Rule? 2. And will you make any believe that *Definition* of *Juſtification* is none of theſe *Works* of *Art*, which depend on humane Skill? How then came you to be ſo much better at it than I? I find not that you aſcribe it to any *ſpecial Revelation* which you *have*. And if you ſhould aſcribe it to *Piety*, and ſay, *Hoc non eſt Artis, ſed Pietatis opus:* I would go to many a good Woman before you. Nor do you plead general Councils, nor the Authority of the Church. 3. And what ſober Scholar will you make believe, that by laying down this common Rule, I ſignifie ſome *One ſingular Perſon*, as an *Individuum determinatum*, whom

whom therefore I muſt acquaint you with? Theſe things are below a Grave Divine.

Pag. 21. Where you *called me to ſeriouſneſs* or *diligence* in my *ſearch*, and I told *you* by what, and how many Writings, I have manifeſted my almoſt thirty years *Diligence* in this Controverſie, and that I am now grown paſt more *ſerious* and *diligent* Studies; that I might ſhew you what a trifling way it is, for a Man to wrangle with him that hath written ſo many things, to tell the World what his ſtudies of this Point have been, and never to touch them, but to call him a-*new* to *ſerious* diligence: You now expoſtulate with me, whether you *accuſed* me *for want of diligence?* I talk not of *Accuſing*, but I tell you, that I have done my beſt; and that it were a poor kind of dealing with your ſelf, if you had written againſt many, as you have done againſt me twenty five years ago, and very often, if inſtead of taking any notice of your Labours, I ſhould call you now to diligent Studies.

As for your Leſſon, *pag.* 22. that *tumbling over many Books without meditation, may breed but Crudities*, &c. It is very true, and the calamity of too many of the literate Tribe, who think that they have deſerved Credit and Reverence, when they ſay the words which others, whom they would be joyned with, have ſaid before them: Want of good Digeſtion is a common Diſeaſe of many that never complain of it, nor feel any preſent trouble by it.

Pag. 22, 23. You inſinuate that about *Retractation*, which I before detected: I told you when, and where, I *Suſpended* or *Retracted* the Book, and

and for what Reaſons, and you preſently feign a Retractation of the Doctrine, and *of about ſixty Books* of Retractions.

It's well that *pag.* 23. you had the juſtice not to juſtifie your [*Nec dubito quin imputatam Chriſti juſtitiam incluſerit*]; But to confeſs your Injuſtice, was too much: It is not your *own Retractation* that you are for, it ſeems.

§. XIV. *Pag.* 23, 24. You talk as if my ſuppoſing that both [*Juſtice*] and [*Imputation*], are capable of Definitions which are not the Things, were a Fallacy, becauſe [*or*] is a disjunctive; *viz.* When I ſay that the *Definition* of the *one*, *or* the *other*, is not the *Thing*. Do you grant it of them Disjunctively, and yet maintain the contrary of them Conjunct? Yes, you ſay, [*Imputed Juſtice cannot differ from its true definition, unleſs you will have it to differ really from it ſelf*]. And, *pag.* 34. you ſay, [*I am aſhamed you ſhould thus over and over expoſe your ſelf—— as if ſuppoſing* (Definitions) *true, they were not the ſame* Re, *with the* Definitum.—— *Good Sir, talk what you pleaſe in private, to ſuch as underſtand not what you ſay, and let them give* you a *grand* Σοφᾶς *for your pains; but you may do well to uſe more Civility to the reaſon of a Scholar, though he hath not yet worn out his Freſhmans Gown*].

Anſw. This is no light or jeſting Matter: The comfort of Souls dependeth on it. I ſee ſome Men expect that *Reverence of their Scholarſhip* ſhould give them great advantage: But if one argued thus with me for Tranſubſtantiation, I would not turn to him, to eſcape the Guilt of *Incivility*.

If

If the *Definition*, and the *Definitum*, as in queſtion now, *be the ſame Thing*, wo to all the Unlearned World, and wo to all Freſhmen, that yet have not learnt well to define, and wo to all Divines that differ in their Definitions, except thoſe that are in the right.

I know that a *Word* and a *Mental Conception*, are not *Nothing:* They may be called *Things*, but when we diſtinguiſh the *Things* from their *Signs*, *Names*, or *Definitions*, we take not the word [*Things*] ſo laxly, as to comprehend the ſaid *Signs*, *Names*, &c. When we ſay, that the *Thing defined* is *neceſſary*, but to be able *to Define it*, or actually to *Define it*, is not neceſſary (to Salvation) it is notorious that we take *Definition* (as *Defining*) *actively*, as it is *Actus definientis*, and *Definire* ſure is not the ſame with the *Thing defined*. I have heard before your Letter told me, that *Definitum & definitio idem ſunt:* But, I pray you, let us not quibble almoſt all the World under a ſentence of Damnation. As long ago as it is ſince I read ſuch words, I remember our Maſters told us, (I think *Scibler* in his *Topicks* for one) that when they are taken *Pro terminis Logicis definitio & definitum non ſunt idem*; but only when they are taken *Pro rebus per eos terminos ſignificatis*; and that there they differ in *Modo ſignificandi eſſentiam*, the *definitum ſignifying* the *Eſſence confuſedly*, and the *Definition diſtinctly*. If you will take the *Res definita*, for that which is ſtrictly nothing but *Rei conceptus inadæquatus ſeu partialis*, (that is, a *Species*) and that not as the *thing* is *Exiſtent extra intellectum*, but as the conception is an operation of the Mind, ſo I confeſs, that he that hath a *true Conception* of

a

a *Species* as *meerly denominated*, or *as defined*, hath *the ſame conception* of it: And alſo the *Thing named*, and the *Thing defined*, is the *ſame thing in it ſelf*. *Homo & Animal rationale*, are the ſame; that is, it is the *ſame eſſence*, which is *denominated Homo*, and *defined Animal rationale*. And it is the ſame *Conceptus mentis*, which we have (if true) when we *denominate*, and when we *define*. But as *Things* are diſtinct from the *knowledg and ſigns* of Things, nothing is *Res*, that is not *exiſtent*; and nothing *exiſteth* but in *Singulars* (or *Individuals*): And as nothing can be defined but a *Species*, ſo a *Species*, or any *Univerſal*, is *nothing* but a *Notion*, or *Ens rationis*, ſave as it *exiſteth* in the ſaid *Individuals*. And in the *Individuals*, it is nothing but *their being* as *partially*, or *inadequatly taken*, or a *Conceptus objectivus partialis*, (whether it be of a thing *really*, or only *intellectually* partible, or any thing which our narrow Minds cannot conceive of, *Uno & ſimplici conceptu activo*). Now if you take the word [*Definition*] for the *Species*, as *exiſtent in Individuals*, it is *really a part* of the thing; that is, a *Partial objective conceptus*, or ſomewhat of the *Thing* as *Intelligible*: But this is to take [*Definition*] in *Senſu paſſivo*, for the Thing defined; which our Caſe diſtinguiſheth.

But Sir, I crave your leave, to diſtinguiſh *Real objective Beings*, from, 1. The *Knowledg*, 2. and the Names, and other Logical Organs, by which we *know* them, and *expreſs* our knowledg of them: God, Chriſt, Grace, Glory, Pardon, Juſtification, Sanctification, the Goſpel-Doctrine, Precept, Promiſes, Faith, Hope, Love, Obedience, Humility, Patience, *&c.* are the *Res definite*

i.

in our *Caſe*, not as they are *in eſſe cognite*, or in the notion or idea of them, but *in eſſe reali*. To *Define* properly, is either, 1. *Mentally* to *conceive* of theſe things; 2. or *Expreſſively*, to ſignifie ſuch *Conceptions*, agreeably to the nature of the things *known*, or *Expreſſively defined*: Which is, if the Definition be perfect, under the notions of a *Genus*, and *Differentia*. The Definition as in *Words*, is but a *Logical Organ*, (as *Names* are alſo *Notifying ſigns*): *Mental defining*, is but the ſaid *diſtinct knowledg* of the thing defined, and is neither *really* the *Thing it ſelf*, nor uſually of neceſſity to the Thing: Which two, I ſhall prove diſtinctly as to the ſenſe of our Caſe.

1. The Definition of Juſtification, is either our *Diſtinct knowledg*, or *Expreſſion* of it: Juſtification is not our *Diſtinct knowledg*, or *Expreſſion* of it: Therefore the Definition of Juſtification, and Juſtification, are not the ſame.

Juſtification *In ſenſu activo*, is not an Act of God, and *In ſenſu paſſivo*, is the Relative ſtate of Man thereby effected: But the Definition of Juſtification is neither.

The Definition of Juſtification, is a work of Art; but Juſtification is a Work of Grace.

A wicked damnable Man, or a damned Devil, may *define* Juſtification, and ſo have the *Definition* of it; but not Juſtification it ſelf.

The Definition of Juſtification, Faith, Love, &c. is *Quid Logicum*; but *Juſtification*, *Faith*, *Love*, &c. are things *Phyſical* and *Moral*.

A Man is Juſtified (or hath Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed to him) in his ſleep, and when he think-

eth not of it; but he hath not the Active *definition* of Juſtification in his ſleep, *&c.*

Other things be not the ſame Really with their Definition, therefore neither is *Juſtification*, *Faith*, &c.

The Sun is not really the ſame thing with a Definition of the Sun; nor Light, Heat, Motion, *&c.* A Brute can ſee, taſte, feel, ſmell, that cannot define them. If you have a Biſhoprick, becauſe you *define* a Biſhoprick, or have a Lordſhip, a Kingdom, Health, *&c.* becauſe you can define them, your Axiome hath ſtood you in good ſtead.

The Definition is but *Explicatio rei*: But *Rei explicatio non eſt ipſa res.*

Individuals (ſay moſt) are not *Definable*: But nothing is truly *Res*, but Individuals. *Univerſals* as they are *in the Mind*, are *exiſtent Individual Acts*, *Cogitations*, *Notions*: As they are *out of the Mind*, they are *nothing* but *Individuorum quid intelligibile.*

The Definition of Learning, of a Doctor, *&c.* may be got in a day: If Learning and Doctorſhip may be ſo, what uſeleſs things are Univerſities and Books?

Perſwade a hungry Scholar, that he hath Meat and Drink; or the Ambitious, that he hath Preferment; or the Covetous, or Poor, that he hath Money, becauſe he hath in his Mind, or Mouth, the *Definition* of it; and quibble him into ſatisfaction by telling him, that *Definitio & definitum ſunt idem re.* We *know* and *expreſs* things *narrowly* by *Names*, and *largely* and *diſtinctly* by *Definitions*: The *Definition* here, is *Explicatio nominis*, (as *Animal*

mal rationale, of the *name Homo*); and both *Name* and *Definition*, as they are *Verba mentis vel orii*, or *Verborum ſignificatio*, are ſurely divers from the things *named* and *defined*, known and expreſſed; unleſs by the *Thing* you mean only the *Knowledg*, or *Notion* of the Thing.

Therefore though *Cui competit definitio eidem quoq; competit definitum, & contra, & quod convenit definitioni convenit definito:* Yet ſay not that *Imputed Righteouſneſs in Re*, is the ſame with the *Definition*, as it is the *Definers* act.

By this time you have helpt Men to underſtand by an Inſtance, why St. *Paul* ſo much warneth Chriſtians to take heed leſt any deceive them by vain Philoſophy, even by Sophiſtry, and abuſed arbitrary Notions.

Remember, Sir, that our Caſe is of grand Importance; As it is ſtated in my *Direct.* 42. which you aſſaulted; it is [*Whether if the Queſtion were of the Object of Predeſtination, of the nature of the Will's liberty, Divine concourſe*, and *determining way of Grace, of the Definition of Juſtification, Faith*, &c. *a few well ſtudied Divines are not here to be preferred before Authority, and the major Vote.* Such are my words. I aſſert, 1. That the *Defining of Juſtification, Faith*, &c. is a work of Art. 2. And I have many and many times told the World (which you ſeem to ſtrike at) that Chriſtians do not differ ſo much in their *Real conceptions* of the *Matter*, as they do in their *Definitions*. 1. Becauſe *Definitions* are made up of *Ambiguous words*, whoſe Explication they are not agreed in; and almoſt all Words are ambiguous till explained, and ambiguous Words are not fit to define, or

be defined, till explained. And, 2. Because both selecting fit terms, and explaining them, and ordering them, are works of Art, in which Men are unequal; and there is as great variety of Intellectual Conceptions, as of Faces. 3. And I have often said, That a *Knowledg intuitive*, or a *Simple apprehension* of a thing as *Sensate*, or an *Internal experience*, or *Reflect act*, and a general notion of some things, may prove the truth of Grace, and save Souls, and make us capable of Christian Love and Communion, as being true saving Knowledg. 4. And consequently I have often said, that many a thousand Christians have *Faith*, *Hope*, *Desire*, *Love*, *Humility*, *Obedience*, *Justication*, *Adoption*, *Union with Christ*, who can *define* none of these: Unless you will speak equivocally of *Definition* it self, and say as good *Melanchon*, and as *Gutberleth*, and some other Romists, that *Notitia intuitiva est definitio*, who yet say but what I am saying, when they add, [*Vel saltem instar definitionis*]. If all are without *Faith*, *Love*, *Justification*, *Adoption*, who cannot give a true Definition of them, how few will be saved? How much more then doth *Learning* to Mens salvation, than Grace? And *Aristotle* then is not so far below *Paul*, or the Spirit of Christ, as we (justly) believe.

The Case is so weighty and palpable, that you have nothing to say; but as you did about the Guilt of our nearer Parents sins, to yield all the Cause, and with a passionate clamour to tell Men that I mistake you, or wrest your words; of which I shall appeal to every sober Reader, that will peruse the words of mine which you assault, and yours

as

as they are an Anſwer to mine.

In a word, you go about by the abuſe of a trivial *Axiome* of *Definitions*, 1. To ſentence moſt Chriſtians to Hell, and caſt them into Deſperation, as wanting the Grace which they cannot define. 2. And to deſtroy Chriſtian Love and Concord, and tear the Church into as many Shreds, as there be diverſities of Definitions uſed by them. 3. And you would tempt us to think much hardlier of your ſelf, than we muſt or will do; as if your *Faith*, *Juſtification*, &c. were unſound, becauſe your Definitions are ſo.

I know that *Unius rei una tantum eſt Definitio*, ſpeaking, 1. Not of the *Terms*, but the *Senſe*. 2. And ſuppoſing that *Definition* to be perfectly true; that is, the *truth* of *Intellection* and *Expreſſion* conſiſting in their congruity to the *Thing*; while the *thing* is *one* and the ſame, the *conception* and *expreſſion* which is perfectly true, muſt be ſo too. But, 1. Our *underſtandings* are all imperfect, and we know *nothing* perfectly but *Secundum quædam*; and *Zanchez* ſaith truly, that *Nihil ſcitur*, if we call that only *Knowledg* which is *perfect*: And conſequently no *Mental Definition* is perfect. 2. And *Imperfections* have many degrees. 3. And our *Terms*, which make up that which you know I called a *Definition* in my *Dir.* 42. (as it is in words) are as aforeſaid, *various*, *mutable*, and variouſly underſtood and uſed.

§. XV. *Pag.* 24. Again you are at it, [*Whom do you mean by that one rare Perſon, whoſe ſingle Judgment is to be preferred in the point of Juſtification, and to whom*].

Answ. 1. No one that knoweth not the difference between an *Invididuum vagum & determinatum.* 2. No one that is of so hard Metal, as in despite of the plainest words, to insinuate to the World, that these words [*A few well-studied Judicious Divines*] do signifie only one; and that these words [*One Man of extraordinary understanding* and *clearness*], (*is to be preferred before the Rulers* and *major Vote, in difficult speculations*) do signifie *one individuum determinatum* in the World, and that the Speaker is bound to name the Man. No one that thinketh that *Pemble*, who in his *Vind. Grat.* hath almost the very same words, said well, and that I who repeat them, am as criminal as you pretend: No one who either knoweth not, that almost all the World (even Papists) agree in this Rule, or that thinketh his judgment fit herein to bear them all down: No one who, when his abuses are brought into the open Sun-shine, will rather accuse the Light than repent.

But, *pag.* 25. After some words to jeer away Conviction, you tell me, [*We must have some better account of you*, quem quibus, *than what you have given us yet. I shall take leave to present our indifferent Readers with a more ingenuous and truer state of the Question, far more suitable both to my plain meaning and the clear purport of your Direction. Let the Case be this: There is One who of late hath raised much dust among us, about the grand Article of Justification; Whether it be by Faith without Works, or by Faith and Works too? All our old Renowned Divines on this side and beyond the Seas are unanimously agreed, that Justification is by Faith alone*, i. e. *without Works. This one Person hath*

hath often publiſhed his Judgment to the contrary—— ſo that a poor Academical Doctor may very rationally enquire of you, Who in this caſe is to be preferred? That one, or thoſe many?

Anſw. There was a Diſputant who would undertake to conquer any Adverſary: When he was asked, *How?* He ſaid he would pour out upon him ſo many and ſo groſs untruths, as ſhould leave him nothing to anſwer congruouſly, but a *Mentiris*; and then all the World would judg him uncivil, and condemn him for giving ſuch an unreverent anſwer. But you ſhall not ſo prevail with me, but I will call your Reader to anſwer theſe Queſtions:

1. Whether it be any truer, that [*This is the clear purport of my Direction*], than it is that I ſay, *There is but one Star* in the Firmament, becauſe I ſay that *one Star is more Luminous than many Candles?*

2. Whether if a diſeaſed Reader will put ſuch a Senſe upon my words, his Forgery be a true *ſtating* of the Queſtion between him and me, without my conſent?

3. Whether an intimation that this ONE is either *Unicus*, or *Primus*, or *Singular*, in the definition of Juſtification, or the intereſt of Works, be any truer, than that he is the only ejected Miniſter in *England*, While the writings of *Bucer*, *Ludov. Crocius*, *Joh. Bergius*, *Conrad. Bergius*, *Calixtus*, *Placeus*, *le Blanc*, *Dave. Gatak*. *Wott. Preſt. Ball*, and multitudes ſuch are viſible ſtill among us?

4. Whether he deals *truly*, *wiſely*, or *friendly* with the holy Scripures, and the Proteſtants, who would perſwade the Ignorant, that this is the true ſtate of the Controverſie, [*Whether it be by Faith without Works, or by Faith and Works too, that we*

are justified] While the Scripture speaketh *both*, and all Protestants hold both in several senses? And whether this easie stating of Controversies, without more Explication or Distinction, be worthy an Academical Disputant?

5. Whether it be true or notoriously false, that [*All our Renowned Divines on this side, and beyond the Seas, are agreed*], of that in this Question of the interest of Works, which this one contradicteth?

6. Whether this Doctors naked Affirmation hereof be better proof, than that *one* Mans citation of the words of above an Hundred (yea many Hundred) as giving as much to Works as he doth, is of the contrary?

7. Whether it be an ingenuous way beseeming Academics, to talk at this rate, and assert such a stating of the Question and such consent, without one word of notice or mention of the Books, in which I state the Question, and bring all this evidence of consent?

8. If such a Doctor will needs enquire, whether the secret thoughts of the Writer meant *not himself*, when he pretendeth but to accuse the Rule there given, and should enquire but of the meaning of the words, whether it savour more of *Rationality*, or a presumptuous usurping the Prerogative of God?

§. XVI. *Pag.* 27. Though your approach be wrathful, you are constrained to come *nearer* yet, and you *cannot* deny my Rule of Direct. in other Points, but only those of [*High and difficult speculation*]: And do you deny it there? You will

will deal with it but as the application of that Rule to the *Definition of Juſtification?* (And ſhall we loſe your favour, by forcing you to lay by your Oppoſition as to all the reſt?) But here you ſay you [*exceedingly differ from me*]; Or elſe you would be aſhamed of ſo much Combating in the dark: *Exceeding* oft ſignifieth ſome extream.

Your Reaſons are, 1. *You hold not the Doctrine of Juſtification to be properly of Speculative concern, but wholly Practical:* Where yet you confeſs, that in all *Practical knowledg, there be ſome antecedent contemplations of the Nature, Properties, End, Object*, and that to *know the certain number of Paces home-ward, is a Speculative nicety*].

Anſw. And can you find no fairer a ſhift for diſagreement? I would ſuch as you made not the Doctrine of Juſtification too little *Practical?* I am far from thinking that it is not Practical: But is not a *Logical definition* the opening the *Nature, Properties, End, Object*, or ſome of theſe which you call Contemplations? Make not plain things dark, Sir: The uſe of Art is not to ſhut the Windows, and confound Mens Minds. I take all *Theologie* to be together, *Scientia-affectiva-practica*; for our *Intellect, Will*, and *Practice*, muſt be poſſeſt or ruled by it: But it is firſt *Scientia*, and we muſt *know* before we can *will* and *practiſe*. And though all right knowledg tend to Practice, yet forgive me for telling you, that I think that many holy Perſons in Scripture and Primitive times, loved and practiſed more than you or I, who knew not how to form an exact Logical Definition. And that he that knoweth the things of the Spirit ſpiritually, by Scripture Notions, may practiſe them

as

as fully, as he that knoweth and ſpeaketh them in the Notions of *Ariſtotle*; or elſe the School-Men excel the Apoſtles. Though ambling be an eaſie Pace, which Horſes are taught by Gives and Fetters, it followeth not that a Horſe cannot travel as far in his natural pace. When you have ſaid all, *Logical defining* ſhall be a work of Art, and the *Church ſhould* not *be torn*, and *Souls ſhall not be damned*, for want of it. He that *Loveth*, *Believeth*, *Hopeth*, *Obeyeth*, and by *doing* them hath a reflecting perception what they are, and hath but ſuch a knowledg of the Goſpel as may be had without a proper Definition, ſhall be ſaved.

2. Pag. 28, 29. you ſay, [*Nor is the Doctrine of Juſtification ſo high and difficult, but that the meaneſt Chriſtian may underſtand it ſufficiently to Salvation, ſo far as words can make it intelligible*].

Anſw. Your own blows ſeem not to hurt you. I thank you for granting ſo much *hope* to the *meaneſt Chriſtians*. But what's this to your Caſe? 1. Do the meaneſt Chriſtians know how to *define* Juſtification, and all the Grace which they have? 2. Are they acquainted with all the [*Words that ſhould make it intelligible?*]

Pag. 29. you add, [*You have done little ſervice to your weaker Chriſtians to perſwade them otherwiſe (as well as to the great bleſſed Charter of Salvation) and to lead them out of the plain road into Woods and Mazes, to that one Man of extraordinary Judgment and Clearneſs; no body muſt know what his Name is, or where he dwells, and ſo to whirle them about till you have made them giddy*——].

Anſw. How eaſie is it to talk at this rate for any Cauſe in the World? Is this Diſputing or Reaſon-

ſoning? Cannot I as eaſily ſay thus againſt you? But the queſtion is of *Things viſible:* I willingly appeal to any intelligent impartial Divine, who will read what you and I have written of Juſtification, which of us it is that hath done more to bring Men *out of Woods and Mazes*, into the *plaineſt Road?* Let them, that have leiſure for no more, read but my *Preface to my Diſput. of Juſtif.* and mark which ſide wrongeth *weak Chriſtians*, and the *Charter of Salvation.*

§. XVII. Pag. 29. you add, [*Sir, I underſtand ſomething at theſe years, without your Tutorage, of the duty both of Paſtors and People: But I know not what you mean to make the way to Heaven (revealed ſufficiently to all, &c.) to be a matter of high abſtruſe Speculation, as if none but great Scholars, and Men of extraordinary Judgment, could by the right uſe of Scriptures, and other ordinary common means, be able to find it out, till they have met with that Elias*, &c.]

Anſw. Still I ſee we ſhall agree whether you will or not: O, Sir, it is juſt the contrary that I wrote for: And I need but repeat your words to anſwer you. I am not diſparaging your underſtanding, otherwiſe than you may ſo call the vindicating of needful truth: Nor did I ever preſume to offer you my Tutorage: You ſpeak all thiswith too much tenderneſs. But that which I have written almoſt all my Books of Controverſie againſt, is this *making the Way to Heaven more difficult* and bewildring, than the Scriptures make it. Therefore it is that I have perſwaded Men to lay leſs ſtreſs on arbitrary humane Notions: But the queſtion

ſtion is now, whether it be your *Courſe* or *mine*, that is guilty of this? Are *Logical Definitions* the *neceſſary Way to Heaven?* Doth the *Scripture* ſufficiently reveal ſuch *Definitions* to all? Do *all ordinary Believers* by the *uſe of the Scripture*, know how to *define?* Do not Logicians make true defining one of the ſureſt ſigns of *clear* and *accurate* knowledg? Why ſhould you and I diſpute thus about Matters of Fact? I know by the principles of Conformity, that your Judgment is not like to be *narrower* than *mine* about the ſtate of determinate Individuals: I ſuppoſe you would take as many to the *Lords Supper* as Believers, as I would, and *abſolve* as many, and *pronounce* as many *ſaved* at *Buryal*. Let you and I call but a dozen of the next Families together, and deſire every Man and Woman of them, to give you a Definition of Juſtification, (out of the hearing of the reſt) and if they all *give you a true definition*, and *one definition*, I will write a Retractation. I know you not; but by your now telling me, of your *underſtanding* of the duties of *Paſtors* and *People*, I may ſuppoſe that you *have been a Paſtour*, (elſe——). And if ſo, that you have had perſonal conference with *moſt* (if not *all*) of your Flock. If you have found them all ſuch *able concordant Definers of Juſtification*, you have had a more learned Flock than I had. I doubt your *Learned Scholars* could not do it, till they met with ſome ſuch *Elias* or *Ariſtotle*, as you! Yea, let us take only ſuch as by their Lives we commonly judg truly Godly Chriſtians: And if all *theſe* give you *one* and a *true* definition of Juſtification, then do you tell them that *Defining* is no ſuch difficult work, but ordinary Chriſtians

ſtians may and do attain it, and I that make it difficult, make the way to Heaven difficult, for Defining is the way to Heaven: But if not one of many Score or Hundred (till you teach them anew) do give you a *true* and the *ſame* Definition; I will go on and ſtill ſay, that *They wrong Souls, the Goſpel,* and *the Church, who pretend ſuch neceſſity and facility of defining,* and *will cenſure, reproach,* or damn all that agree not with them in a Definition, when they have as *real* though leſs *diſtinct* a knowledg of the thing.

I doubt not but you know how much difference there is among Learned Men about *Definitions* themſelves in general: Whether they belong to Metaphyſicks, Logicks, or Phyſicks? Whether *Definitio Phyſica* (as *Man* is defined *per Animam, Corpus & Unionem*) be a *proper Definition?* Whether a true *Logical* and *Phyſical* definition ſhould not be the ſame? Whether *Definitio objectiva* be properly called *Definitio,* or only *Formalis?* Whether *Accidents* may be properly defined? *An Genus definiri poſſit? An pars Logica definiri poſſit? An individua poſſint definiri?* (*Inquit* Hurtado, *Negari non poteſt Individuis definitio ſubſtantialis; & quidem eſſentialis Phyſice; eſt enim de eſſentia hujus hominis hæc anima cum hoc Corpore; Imo & eſſentialis Metaphyſice—— ſi individua rectè poſſent penetrari, illorum definitio eſſet omnium perfectiſſima*) *An ea quæ differunt definitione diſtinguuntur realiter?* With a multitude ſuch. And is the *Art of Defining* ſo *eaſie,* as that *ordinary Chriſtians ſalvation* muſt lie upon it, when ſo many things about Defining are among the ſubtileſt Doctors undetermined?

And

And as Ignorant as I am, while you ſuppoſe *me* unable to *define Juſtification*, I would wiſh you (not for my ſake, but *theirs*) that you will not ſentence all as unjuſtified to Damnation, that are not more skilful in defining than I, and that you will not reject all ſuch from the Sacrament and Communion of the Church.

§. XVIII. Yet again, *pag.* 30. you tell me, [*I cannot well ſwallow down in the lump, what you would have me and others to do, when you direct us to prefer that one Man before the Rulers and majority of Votes, till you acquaint us who that Gentleman is, and what ſort of Rulers and Majorities you mean*].

Anſw. What you cannot ſwallow you muſt leave: I will not cram or drench you. I could wiſh for your own ſake, that you had not thus often told the World of ſuch a Malady, as that muſt needs be which hindreth your ſwallow: When, 1. You your ſelf receive the ſame Rule in other Inſtances, and make all this ſtir againſt it only, as to the *Definition of Juſtification*, even the *Logical definition*, which is *Actus definientis*, called *Definitio formalis*, and not the *Definitio objectiva*, as the *Ipſum definitum* is by ſome improperly called. 2. And when the words in that Inſtance are not [*ONE MAN*] but [*a few Men*] which your Eyes may ſtill ſee; and when in the *General* direction where *one Man* is mentioned, there is no ſuch word as [*that one Man*], or the leaſt intimation of an *Individuum determinatum*; You greatly wrong your Honour by ſuch dealing; As you do by adding,

1. *For*

1. [*For the ſingle Perſon (that Monarch in Divinity) to whom we are upon differences to make our Appeals*, &c.]

Anſw. If you hold on thus to talk as in your ſleep, and will not ſhut your Chamber-door, but commiſſion the Preſs to report your words to the World, how can your beſt Friends ſecure your reputation? Is not all this talk of *ſingle Perſon*, and *Monarch in Divinity*, and *Appeals*, the effects of a Dream, or ſomewhat worſe? Theſe *Fictions* will ſerve no honeſt ends. But you next come indeed to the true *difficulty of the Caſe*, and aſk:

[*I beſeech you Sir, how ſhall your ignorant or weaker Chriſtian be able to judg of fitneſs?—— He had need to have a very competent meaſure of Abilities himſelf, who is to give his verdict of anothers*, &c.]

This is very true and rational: But it concerneth *you* as *much* as *me* to *anſwer* it, unleſs you will renounce the Rule. And ſeeing you grant it in other Inſtances, if you pleaſe to anſwer your own queſtion as to thoſe other, you have anſwered it as to this: And if you will not learn of your ſelf, I am not ſo vain as to think, that you will learn of me.

In caſe of *Subtilties* which depend upon *Wit*, and *Art*, and *Induſtry*, in that proportion which few, even faithful Men attain, I remember but one of theſe ways that can be taken; Either wholly to *ſuſpend* our *Judgments*, and not to meddle with them, till we can reach them our ſelves; Or to take them *fide humana*, or as *probabilities* on the Credit of ſome Men, rather than others: As to the firſt, I am for as much *ſuſpenſion* of Judgment,

as

And as Ignorant as I am, while you ſuppoſe *me* unable to *define Juſtification*, I would wiſh you (not for my ſake, but *theirs*) that you will not ſentence all as unjuſtified to Damnation, that are not more skilful in defining than I, and that you will not reject all ſuch from the Sacrament and Communion of the Church.

§. XVIII. Yet again, *pag.* 30. you tell me, [*I cannot well ſwallow down in the lump, what you would have me and others to do, when you direct us to prefer that one Man before the Rulers and majority of Votes, till you acquaint us who that Gentleman is, and what ſort of Rulers and Majorities you mean*].

Anſw. What you cannot ſwallow you muſt leave: I will not cram or drench you. I could wiſh for your own ſake, that you had not thus often told the World of ſuch a Malady, as that muſt needs be which hindreth your ſwallow: When, 1. You your ſelf receive the ſame Rule in other Inſtances, and make all this ſtir againſt it only, as to the *Definition of Juſtification*, even the *Logical definition*, which is *Actus definiendi*, called *Definitio formalis*, and not the *Definitio objectiva*, as the *Ipſum definitum* is by ſome improperly called. 2. And when the words in that Inſtance are not [*ONE MAN*] but [*a few Men*] which your Eyes may ſtill ſee; and when in the *General* direction where *one Man* is mentioned, there is no ſuch word as [*that one Man*], or the leaſt intimation of an *Individuum determinatum*; You greatly wrong your Honour by ſuch dealing; As you do by adding,

1. *For*

1. [*For the ſingle Perſon (that Monarch in Divinity) to whom we are upon differences to make our Appeals*, &c.]

Anſw. If you hold on thus to talk as in your ſleep, and will not ſhut your Chamber-door, but commiſſion the Preſs to report your words to the World, how can your beſt Friends ſecure your reputation? Is not all this talk of *ſingle Perſon*, and *Monarch in Divinity*, and *Appeals*, the effects of a Dream, or ſomewhat worſe? Theſe *Fictions* will ſerve no honeſt ends. But you next come indeed to the true *difficulty of the Caſe*, and ask:

[*I beſeech you Sir, how ſhall your ignorant or weaker Chriſtian be able to judg of fitneſs?—— He had need to have a very competent meaſure of Abilities himſelf, who is to give his verdict of anothers*, &c.]

This is very true and rational: But it concerneth *you* as *much* as *me* to *anſwer* it, unleſs you will renounce the Rule. And ſeeing you grant it in other Inſtances, if you pleaſe to anſwer your own queſtion as to thoſe other, you have anſwered it as to this: And if you will not learn of your ſelf, I am not ſo vain as to think, that you will learn of me.

In caſe of *Subtilties* which depend upon *Wit*, and *Art*, and *Induſtry*, in that proportion which few, even faithful Men attain, I remember but one of theſe ways that can be taken; Either wholly to *ſuſpend* our *Judgments*, and not to meddle with them, till we can reach them our ſelves; Or to take them *fide humana*, or as *probabilities* on the Credit of ſome Men, rather than others: As to the firſt, I am for as much *ſuſpenſion* of Judgment,

as

as will ſtand with the part of a Learner (where we muſt learn; and in uſeleſs things for a total ſuſpenſion). But where *Learning* is a duty, all Men come to *Knowledg* by *degrees*, and things uſually appear to them in their *probability*, before they appear in *aſcertaining evidence*. Therefore here the Queſtion is, Whoſe judgment I ſhall take as *moſt probable?* (Were the caſe only, how far we ſhould *Preach* our Judgment to others, there *Rulers* muſt more determine; or if it were, How to manage our Judgment ſo as to keep *Unity* and *Concord*, the *Church*, or *major Vote* muſt over-rule us). But it being the *meer Judgment* or *Opinion* that is in queſtion, either we muſt adhere to the Judgment, 1. Of *Rulers* as *ſuch*, 2. Or the *major Vote as ſuch*, 3. Or to thoſe that are *moſt Excellent* in that *part of Knowledg*: Why ſhould I waſte time to give you the Reaſons againſt the two firſt, which are commonly received? When even the *Papiſts*, who go as far as any I know living in aſcribing to *One Man*, and to *major Votes*, yet all agree, that *a few ſubtile Doctors*, yea *one* in the things in which he excelleth, is to be preferred before *Pope* or *Council*: And therefore the *Scotiſts* prefer one *Scotus*, *Lychetus*, *Memiſſe*, *Rada*, &c. before a *Pope* or Multitude; and ſo do the *Nominals*, one *Ockam*, *Gregory*, *Gabriel*, *Hurtado*, &c. and ſo the other Sects.

The thing then being ſuch as neither you, nor any Man can deny, the difficulty which you urge, doth preſs you and all Men: And it is indeed one *grand calamity* of *Mankind*, and not the leaſt hinderance of Knowledg in the World; that he that *hath it not*, *knoweth not* what another hath, but by dark

dark Conjectures. 4. And therefore Parents and Pupils know not who is their beſt Tutor: The hearers that are to chuſe a Teacher, hardly know whom to chuſe; for, as you ſay truly, he muſt know much that muſt judg of a knowing Man.

God hath in all *Arts and Sciences* given ſome few Men an excellency of *Wit and Reach* above the generality of their Profeſſion, and they have a more clear and ſolid Judgment: If *all Men* could but know *who theſe be*, the World would in one Age be more recovered from Ignorance than it hath been in ten. But the *power* of the *Proud*, and the *confidence* of the *Ignorant*, and the *number of all theſe*, and the *Slanders* and *Scorn*, and peeviſh Wranglings of the *common Pride* and *Ignorance* againſt thoſe *few* that *know* what *they know not*, is the Devils great means to fruſtrate their endeavours, and keep the World from having knowledg. This is *certain* and *weighty* Truth, and ſuch as you ſhould make no Malignant applications of, nor ſtrive againſt. Mankind muſt needs acknowledg it. Your urgent queſtioning here [*Do you not mean your ſelf?*] doth but expoſe you to pity, by opening that which you might have concealed.

And to your Queſtion I ſay, could I enable all Ignorant Men to know who are the beſt Teachers, I ſhould be the grand Benefactor of the World: But both the *bleſſing of excellent Teachers*, and alſo of *acquaintance* with them and *their worth*, is given by God, partly as it pleaſeth Him, freely, even to the unworthy, and partly as a Reward to thoſe that have been faithful in a little, and obeyed lower helps; (for there is a *Worthineſs* to be found in ſome Houſes, where the Preacher cometh with the

voice of *Peace*, and *unworthineſs*, which oft depriveth Men of ſuch Mercies.) Both abſolutely *Free-Grace*, and alſo *Rewarding-Grace*, do here ſhew themſelves.

But yet I add, 1. That *Light* is a *ſelf-demonſtrating thing*; and will not eaſily be hid. 2. And thoſe that are the Children of Light, and have been true to former helps and convictions, and are willing to ſell all for the Pearl, and fear not being loſers by the price of *Knowledg*, but would have it whatever Labour or Suffering it muſt coſt, and who ſearch for it impartially and diligently, and forfeit it not by Sloth, or a fleſhly, proud, or worldly Mind, theſe, I ſay, are prepared to diſcern the Light; when others fall under the heavy Judgment of being deceived by the *Wranglings*, *Scorns*, *Clamours* and *Threatnings* of PROUD IGNORANCE. And thus one *Auguſtine* was a Light in his time, and though ſuch as *Proſper*, *Fulgentius*, &c. knew him, *Pelagius* and the *Maſſilienſes* wrangled againſt him: And *Luther*, *Melanchon*, *Bucer*, *Phagius*, *Zuinglius*, *Calvin*, *Muſculus*, *Zanchius* were ſuch in their times; and ſome diſcerned them to be ſo, and more did not: If Men muſt have gone by the judgment of Rulers, or the major Vote of Teachers, what had become of the Reformation? If you can better direct Men how to diſcern Gods Gifts and Graces in His Servants, do it, and do not cavil againſt it.

As for your [*One ſingle Proteſtant in ſuch a caſe as Juſtification*], and your [*I wiſh it be not your meaning*] Pag. 31. they deſerve no further anſwer, nor I all the anger, *pag.* 31, 32, 33.

§. XIX.

§. XIX. But *pag.* 34. Note again, 1. That it is not *Objective Definitions*, (as ſome *call* them) but [*Logical*, *Artificial Definitions*,] ſuppoſed to be Mens needful *Acts*, which you ſay are *Re*, the ſame with the *Definitum*. 2. And that yet you muſt have it [*ſuppoſed that theſe Definitions are true*]. And I ſuppoſe that few Good Chriſtians comparatively know a *true one*, no, nor what a Definition, (or the *Genus* and *Differentia* which conſtitute it) is.

You ſay, [*I abſolutely deny what you ſo raſhly avow, that the Definition of Juſtification is controverted by the greateſt Divines: This is one of your liberal Dictates: The Reformed Divines are all, I think, before you, agreed about the nature of Juſtification, its Cauſes, &c. and conſequently cannot differ about the Definition*].

Anſw. 1. But what if *all Divines* were ſo *agreed?* So are not *all honeſt Men and Women* that muſt have Communion with us: Therefore make not *Definitions more neceſſary* than they *are*, nor as neceſſary as the Thing.

2. You muſt be conſtrained for the defending of theſe words, to come off by ſaying, that you meant, That though they agree not in the *Words*, or *Logical terms of the Definition*; but one ſaith, *This* is the *Genus*, and *this* is the *Differentia*, and another that it is not *this* but *that*; one ſaith *this*, and another *that* is the *Formal*, *or Material Cauſe*, &c. yet *de re*, they *mean* the ſame thing, were they ſo happy as to agree in their *Logical* defining terms and notions: And if you will do in this, as you have done in your other Quarrels, come off by ſaying as I ſay, and ſhewing Men the power

voice of *Peace*, and *unworthineſs*, which oft depriveth Men of ſuch Mercies.) Both abſolutely *Free-Grace*, and alſo *Rewarding-Grace*, do here ſhew themſelves.

But yet I add, 1. That *Light* is a *ſelf-demonſtrating thing*; and will not eaſily be hid. 2. And thoſe that are the Children of Light, and have been true to former helps and convictions, and are willing to ſell all for the Pearl, and fear not being loſers by the price of *Knowledg*, but would have it whatever Labour or Suffering it muſt coſt, and who ſearch for it impartially and diligently, and forfeit it not by Sloth, or a fleſhly, proud, or worldly Mind, theſe, I ſay, are prepared to diſcern the Light; when others fall under the heavy Judgment of being deceived by the *Wranglings*, *Scorns*, *Clamours* and *Threatnings* of PROUD IGNORANCE. And thus one *Auguſtine* was a Light in his time, and though ſuch as *Proſper*, *Fulgentius*, &c. knew him, *Pelagius* and the *Maſſilienſes* wrangled againſt him: And *Luther*, *Melanchon*, *Bucer*, *Phagius*, *Zuinglius*, *Calvin*, *Muſculus*, *Zanchius* were ſuch in their times; and ſome diſcerned them to be ſo, and more did not: If Men muſt have gone by the judgment of Rulers, or the major Vote of Teachers, what had become of the Reformation? If you can better direct Men how to diſcern Gods Gifts and Graces in His Servants, do it, and do not cavil againſt it.

As for your [*One ſingle Proteſtant in ſuch a caſe as Juſtification*], and your [*I wiſh it be not your meaning*] Pag. 31. they deſerve no further anſwer, nor I all the anger, *pag.* 31, 32, 33.

§. XIX.

§. XIX. But *pag.* 34. Note again, 1. That it is not *Objective Definitions*, (as ſome *call* them) but [*Logical*, *Artificial Definitions*,] ſuppoſed to be Mens needful *Acts*, which you ſay are *Re*, the ſame with the *Definitum*. 2. And that yet you muſt have it [*ſuppoſed that theſe Definitions are true*]. And I ſuppoſe that few Good Chriſtians comparatively know a *true one*, no, nor what a Definition, (or the *Genus* and *Differentia* which conſtitute it) is.

You ſay, [*I abſolutely deny what you ſo raſhly avow, that the Definition of Juſtification is controverted by the greateſt Divines: This is one of your liberal Dictates: The Reformed Divines are all, I think, before you, agreed about the nature of Juſtification, its Cauſes, &c. and conſequently cannot differ about the Definition*].

Anſw. 1. But what if *all Divines* were ſo *agreed?* So are not *all honeſt Men and Women* that muſt have Communion with us: Therefore make not *Definitions more neceſſary* than they *are*, nor as neceſſary as the Thing.

2. You muſt be conſtrained for the defending of theſe words, to come off by ſaying, that you meant, That though they agree not in the *Words*, or *Logical terms of the Definition*; but one ſaith, *This* is the *Genus*, and *this* is the *Differentia*, and another that it is not *this* but *that*; one ſaith *this*, and another *that* is the *Formal*, *or Material Cauſe*, &c. yet *de re*, they *mean* the ſame thing, were they ſo happy as to agree in their *Logical* defining terms and notions: And if you will do in this, as you have done in your other Quarrels, come off by ſaying as I ſay, and ſhewing Men the power

of Truth, though you do it with never ſo much *anger*, *that you muſt agree*, I ſhall be ſatisfied, that the Reader is delivered from your ſnare, and that Truth prevaileth, what ever you think or ſay of me.

3. But becauſe I muſt now anſwer *what you ſay*, and not *what I foreſee you will or muſt ſay*, I muſt add, that this paſſage ſeemeth to ſuppoſe that your Reader liveth in the dark, and hath read very *little* of Juſtification. 1. Do all thoſe great Divines, who deny the *Imputation of Chriſts active Righteouſneſs*, and take it to be but *Juſtitia Perſonæ, non Meriti*, and that we are Juſtified by the *Paſſive only*, agree with their Adverſaries, who have written againſt them, about the *Definition and Cauſes of Juſtification?* Will any Man believe you, who hath read *Olevian*, *Urſine*, *Paræus*, *Scultetus*, *Piſcator*, *Carolus Molinæus*, *Wendeline*, *Beckman*, *Alſtedius*, *Camero*, with his followers in *France*, *Forbes*, with abundance more, who are for the Imputation of the Paſſive Righteouſneſs only? Were Mr. *Amb. Wotton*, and Mr. *Balmford*, and his other Adverſaries, of the ſame Opinion in this? Was Mr. *Bradſhaw* ſo ſottiſh as to write his Reconciling Treatiſe of Juſtification in *Latine* and *Engliſh*, to reduce Men of differing minds to Concord, while he knew that there was no difference, ſo much as in the Definition? Was he miſtaken in reciting the great differences about their Senſes of *Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs*, if there were none at all? Did Mr. *Gataker* agree with *Lucius and Piſcator*, when he wrote againſt both (as the extreams)? Did Mr. *Wotton*, and *John Goodwin*, agree with Mr. *G. Walker*, and Mr. *Roborough?* Doth Mr. *Lawſon*, in

in his *Theopolitica* agree with you, and ſuch others? Doth not Mr. *Cartwright here* differ from thoſe that hold the Imputation of the Active Righteouſneſs?

What abundance of *Proteſtants* do place Juſtification only in *Fogiveneſs of Sins?* And yet as many (I know not which is the greater ſide) do make that *Forgiveneſs* but one part, and *Imputation of Righteouſneſs* another. And how many make *Forgiveneſs no part* of Juſtification, but a Concomitant? And many inſtead of [*Imputation of Righteouſneſs*] put [*Accepting us as Righteous, for the ſake, or merit of Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed*] (viz. as the *Meritorious Cauſe*). And *Paræus* tells us, that they are of four Opinions, who are for *Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed*; ſome for the *Paſſive* only; ſome for the *Paſſive* and *Active*; ſome for the *Paſſive*, *Active*, and *Habitual*; ſome for theſe three and the *Divine*. And who knoweth not that ſome here ſo diſtinguiſh Cauſes and Effects, as that our *Original Sin* (or *Habitual* ſay ſome) is pardoned for Chriſts *Original* (and *Habitual*) Holineſs: Our *Omiſſions* for *Chriſts Active Obedience*, and our *Commiſſions* for His *Paſſive*? Or as more ſay that Chriſts *Paſſive Righteouſneſs* as Satisfaction, ſaveth us from Hell or Puniſhment, and His *Active* as meritorious, procureth *Life* as the reward? When many others, rejecting that Diviſion, ſay; That both freedom from Puniſhment, and right to Glory are the conjunct effects of His Habitual, Active, and Paſſive Righteouſneſs, as an entire Cauſe (in its kind); as *Guil. Forbes*, *Grotius*, *Bradſhaw*, and others truly ſay: Beſides that many conclude with *Gataker*, that theſe are indeed but one thing and

effect, (to be *Glorified*, and *not to be Damned* or *Punished*); ſeeing not to be Glorified is the *Pœna damni*, and that the remitting of the whole *Penalty damni & ſenſus*, and ſo of all Sin of Omiſſion and Commiſſion, is our whole Juſtification.

And I need not *tell* any Man that hath read ſuch Writers, that they ordinarily diſtinguiſh of Juſtification, and give not the ſame Definition of one ſort as of *another*, nor of the *Name* in one *Senſe* as in another.

Many confeſs (whom you may read in *Guil. Forbes*, and *Vinc. le Blanck*) that the word [*Juſtifie*] is divers times taken in Scripture (as the *Papiſts* do) as including *Sanctification*: And ſo ſaith *Beza* againſt *Illyricus*, *pag.* 218. as cited by *G. Forbes*, [*Si Juſtificationem generaliter accipias, ut interdum uſurpatur ab Apoſtolo, Sanctificatio non erit ejus effectus, ſed pars aut ſpecies*]: And as I find him (*mihi*) *pag.* 179. *Quamvis Juſtificationis nomen interdum generaliter accipiatur pro omni illius Juſtitiæ dono quam a patre in Chriſto accipimus*, &c.

And how little are we agreed whether *Reconciliation* be a *part* of *Juſtification* or *not?* Yea, or *Adoption* either? Saith *Illyricus* [*Hoc affirmo, recte poſſe dici Juſtificationem eſſe Cauſam omnium beneficiorum ſequentium: Nam juſtificatio eſt plena Reconciliatio cum Deo, quæ nos facit ex hoſtibus filios Dei:*] To which *Beza ibid.* ſaith, (diſtinguiſhing of Reconciliation) *Neutro modo idem eſt Reconciliatio ac Juſtificatio.— Si Remiſſio peccatorum eſt Juſtificationis Definitio, quod negare non auſis*, &c.

Of the three ſorts or parts of Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed to make up three parts of our Juſtification,

tion, ſee him *de Predeſt. pag.* 405. *Col.* 2. which *Perkins* and ſome others alſo follow.

Olevian (as all others that groſly miſtake not herein) did hold, that *God did not judg us to have fulfilled all the Law in Chriſt*; and that our righteouſneſs conſiſteth only in the Remiſſion of Sin, and right to Life as freely given us for anothers Merits: But *Beza* inſiſteth ſtill on the contrary, and in his Epiſtle to *Olevian*, (*pag.*248.*Epiſt.*35.) ſaith, *Quid vanius eſt quam Juſtum arbitrari, qui Legem non impleverit? Atqui lex non tantum prohibet fieri quod vetat,—— verum præcipit quod jubet.—— Ergo qui pro non peccatore cenſetur in Chriſto, mortem quidem effugerit; ſed quo jure vitam præterea petet, niſi omnem juſtitiam Legis in eodem Chriſto impleverit?* (This is the Doctrine which *Wotton* and *Gataker* (in divers Books largely) and *Bradſhaw*, after many others do Confute). Yet ſaith he, *Neque vero id obſtat, quominus noſtra Juſtificatio Remiſſione peccatorum apte & recte definiatur*], Which is a contradiction. Yet was he for Love and Gentleneſs in theſe differences; *ibid.*

Yet *Qu. & Reſp. Chriſt. pag.* 670. He leaveth out Chriſts Original Habitual Righteouſneſs, [*Non illa eſſentialis quæ Deitatis eſt, nec illa Habitualis, ut ita loquar, Puritas Carnis Chriſti.—— Quæ quum non diſtingueret Oſiander fædiſſime eſt hallucinatus.*

And *ibid.* 670. he giveth us this deſcription of Juſtification.

Qu. *Quid Juſtificationem vocat* Paulus *hoc loco?* R. *Illud quo Juſti ſimus*, id eſt, *conſque perfecti, integri*, ἀμεμπτοι καὶ ἄμωμοι, *ut pleniſſime, non tantum aboleatur quicquid in nobis totis in eſt turpitudinis, qua Deus ſumme purus offendi ullo modo*

possit, verum etiam in nos comperiatur quicquid in hac humana natura usque adeo potest eum delectare, ut illud vita æterna pro bona sua voluntate coronet].

Yet (as in his *Annot.* in *Rom.* 8. 30. *& alibi*) he confesseth that *Justification* in Scripture, sometime is taken for *Sanctification*, (or as including it) so he taketh our *Sanctification* to contain the Imputation of Christs Sanctity to us. (Qu. & Resp. pag. 671.) 1. *Dico nostras Personas, imputata ipsius perfecta sanctitate & integritate, plene sanctas & integras, ac proinde Patri acceptas, non in nobis sed in Christo censemur.* 2. And next the Spirits Sanctification; and thus Christ is made *Sanctification* to us.

Dr. *Twisse*, and Mr. *Pemble*, *Vind. Grat.* distinguish of Justification as an Immanent Act in God from Eternity, and as it is the notice of the former in our Consciences: But doubtless the commonest Definitions of Justification agree with neither of these: And *Pemble of Justification* otherwise defineth it (as Mr. *Jessop* saith Dr. *Twisse* did).

Lud. Crocius Syntag. pag. 1219. thus defineth it, [*Justificatio Evangelica est actus Divinæ gratiæ, qua Deus adoptat peccatorem per approbationem obedientiæ Legis in sponsore atque intercessore Christo, & per Remissionem peccatorum ac Justitiæ imputationem in eo qui per fidem Christo est insitus*]. And saith, pag. 1223. [*Fides sola justificat quatenus notat Obedientiam quandam expectantem promissionem ut donum gratuitum — & apponitur illi Obedientiæ quæ non expectat promissionem ut donum omnino gratuitum, sed ut mercedem propositam sub Conditione operis alicujus præter acceptationem & gratitudinem debitam, quæ sua Natura in omni donatione quamvis gratuita requiri*

requiri ſolet. Et ejuſmodi Obedientia peculiariter opus ab Apoſtolo, & Latinis proprie Meritum dicitur; & qui ſub hac conditione obediunt Operantes vocantur, Rom. 4. 4. & 11. 6. This is the truth which I aſſert.

Conrad. Bergius Prax. Cathol. diſ. 7. pag. 983. tells us that the Breme Catechiſm thus openeth the Matter: [Qu. *Quomodo Juſtificatur Homo coram Deo?* R. *Accipit Homo Remiſſionem peccatorum & Juſtificatur, hoc eſt, Gratus fit coram Deo in vera Converſione, perſolam fidem, per Chriſtum, ſine proprio Merito & dignitate.*

Cocceius diſp. de via ſalut. de Juſt. pag. 189. *Originalis Chriſti Juſtitia correſpondet noſtro Originali peccato, &c. vid. cæt. plura vid. de fœder.*

Macovius Colleg. de Juſtif. diſtinguiſheth Juſtification into *Active* and *Paſſive*, and ſaith, *Juſtificatio Activa ſignificat abſolutionem Dei, qua Hominem reum a reatu abſolvit:* And he would prove this to be before Faith, and citeth for it (abuſively) *Paræus* and *Toſſanus*, and thinketh that we were abſolved from Guilt from Chriſts undertaking our Debt, *Theſ.* 12. thus arguing, [*Cujus debita apud Creditorem aliquis recepit exſolvenda, & Creditor iſtius ſponſionem ita acceptat, ut in ea acquieſcat, ille jam ex parte Creditoris liber eſt a debitis: Atque Electorum omnium in ſingulari debita apud Deum Patrem Chriſtus, ex quo factus eſt Mediator, recepit exolvenda, & Deus Pater illam ſponſionem acceptavit*, &c. Paſſive Juſtification, which he ſuppoſeth to be our application of Chriſts Righteouſneſs to our ſelves daily as oft as we offend. *Th.* 5. (And *part* 4. *diſp.* 22. he maintaineth, that *There are no*

Diſ-

poſſit, verum etiam in nos comperiatur quicquid in hac humana natura uſque adeo poteſt eum delectare, ut illud vita æterna pro bona ſua voluntate coronet].

Yet (as in his *Annot.* in *Rom.* 8. 30. *& alibi*) he confeſſeth that *Juſtification* in Scripture, ſometime is taken for *Sanctification*, (or as including it) ſo he taketh our *Sanctification* to contain the Imputation of Chriſts Sanctity to us. (Qu. & Reſp. pag. 671.) 1. *Dico noſtras Perſonas, imputata ipſius perfecta ſanctitate & integritate, plene ſanctas & integras, ac proinde Patri acceptas, non in nobis ſed in Chriſto cenſemur.* 2. And next the Spirits Sanctification; and thus Chriſt is made *Sanctification* to us.

Dr. *Twiſſe*, and Mr. *Pemble*, *Vind. Grat.* diſtinguiſh of Juſtification as an Immanent Act in God from Eternity, and as it is the notice of the former in our Conſciences: But doubtleſs the commoneſt Definitions of Juſtification agree with neither of theſe: And *Pemble of Juſtification* otherwiſe defineth it (as Mr. *Jeſſop* ſaith Dr. *Twiſſe* did).

Lud. Crocius Syntag. pag. 1219. thus defineth it, [*Juſtificatio Evangelica eſt actus Divinæ gratiæ, qua Deus adoptat peccatorem per approbationem obedientiæ Legis in ſponſore atque interceſſore Chriſto, & per Remiſſionem peccatorum ac Juſtitiæ imputationem in eo qui per fidem Chriſto eſt inſitus*]. And ſaith, pag. 1223. [*Fides ſola juſtificat quatenus notat Obedientiam quandam expectantem promiſſionem ut donum gratuitum—— & apponitur illi Obedientiæ quæ non expectat promiſſionem ut donum omnino gratuitum, ſed ut mercedem propoſitam ſub Conditione operis alicujus præter acceptationem & gratitudinem debitam, quæ ſua Natura in omni donatione quamvis gratuita*

requiri

requiri ſolet. Et ejuſmodi Obedientia peculiariter opus ab Apoſtolo, & Latinis proprie Meritum dicitur; & qui ſub hac conditione obediunt Operantes vocantur, Rom. 4. 4. & 11. 6. This is the truth which I aſſert.

Conrad. Bergius Prax. Cathol. diſ. 7. pag. 983. tells us that the Breme Catechiſm thus openeth the Matter: [Qu. *Quomodo Juſtificatur Homo coram Deo?* R. *Accipit Homo Remiſſionem peccatorum & Juſtificatur, hoc eſt, Gratus fit coram Deo in vera Converſione, perſolam fidem, per Chriſtum, ſine proprio Merito & dignitate.*

Cocceius diſp. de via ſalut. de Juſt. pag. 189. *Originalis Chriſti Juſtitia correſpondet noſtro Originali peccato*, &c. *vid. cæt. plura vid. de fœder.*

Macovius Colleg. de Juſtif. diſtinguiſheth Juſtification into *Active* and *Paſſive*, and ſaith, *Juſtificatio Activa ſignificat abſolutionem Dei, qua Hominem reum a reatu abſolvit:* And he would prove this to be before Faith, and citeth for it (abuſively) *Pareus* and *Teſſanus*, and thinketh that we were abſolved from Guilt from Chriſts undertaking our Debt, *Theſ.* 12. thus arguing, [*Cujus debita apud Creditorem aliquis recepit exſolvenda, & Creditor iſtius ſponſionem ita acceptat, ut in ea acquieſcat, ille jam ex parte Creditoris liber eſt a debitis: Atque Electorum omnium in ſingulari debita apud Deum Patrem Chriſtus, ex quo factus eſt Mediator, recepit exolvenda, & Deus Pater illam ſponſionem acceptavit*, &c. Paſſive Juſtification, which he ſuppoſeth to be our application of Chriſts Righteouſneſs to our ſelves daily as oft as we offend. *Th.* 5. (And *part* 4. *diſp.* 22. he maintaineth, that *There are no*

Diſ-

Dispositions to Regeneration). Others of his mind I pass by.

Spanhemius Disput. de Justif. saith, that [The *Form* of *Passive Justification* consisteth in the *apprehension* and *sense* of Remission of Sin and Imputation of Christs Righteousness in capable Subjects] grosly: Whereas Active Justification (*Justificantis*) ever immediately causeth *Passive* (*Justificationem justificati*) which is nothing but the effect of the Active, (or as most call it, *Actio ut in patiente*): And if this were the *Apprehension* and *Sense* (as aforesaid) of *Pardon* and *imputed Righteousness*, then a Man in his sleep were unjustified, and so of Infants, *&c.* For he that is not Passively justified, is not at all justified.

I told you else-where, that the *Synops. Leidens. de Justif. pag.* 413. *Th.* 23. saith, That Christs Righteousness is both the *Meritorious*, *Material*, and *Formal Cause* of our Justification.

What *Fayus*, and *Davenant*, and others say of the *Formal Cause*, viz. *Christs Righteousness* imputed, I there shewed: And how *Paræus*, *Joh. Crocius*, and many others, deny Christs Righteousness to be the Formal Cause.

Wendeline defineth Justification thus (Theol. Lib. 1. c. 25. p. 603.) *Justificatio est actio Dei gratuita, qua peccatores Electi, maledictioni legis obnoxii, propter justitiam seu satisfactionem Christi fide applicatam & a Deo imputatam, coram tribunali Divino, remissis peccatis, a maledictione Legis absolvuntur & justi censentur.* And pag. 615, 616. He maintaineth that [*Obedientia activa, si proprie & accurate loquamur, non est materia nostræ Justificationis, nec imputatur nobis, ita ut nostra censeatur,*

&

& nobis propter eam peccata remittantur, & debitum legis pro nobis ſolvatur; quemadmodum Paſſiva per imputationem cenſetur noſtra, &c. *Et poſt* [*Si dicus Chriſtum factum eſſe hominem pro nobis, hoc eſt, noſtro bono, conceditur: Si pro nobis, hoc eſt, noſtro loco, negatur: Quod enim Chriſtus noſtro loco fecit, & factus eſt, id nos non tenemur facere & fieri,* &c.

Rob. Abbot approveth of *Thompſons* Definition of Evangelical Juſtification, (pag. 153.) that it is, *Qua pœnitenti & Credenti remittuntur peccata, & jus vitæ æternæ conceditur per & propter Chriſti obedientiam illi imputatam:* (Which is ſound, taking *Imputatam* ſoundly, as he doth).

Joh. Crocius, Diſp. 1. p. 5. thus defineth it, [*Actio Dei qua ex gratia propter ſatisfactionem Chriſti peccatoribus in Chriſtum totius Mundi redemptorem unicum, vere credentibus gratis ſine operibus aut meritis propriis omnia peccata remittit, & juſtitiam Chriſti imputat ad ſui nominis gloriam & illorum ſalutem æternam.* And he maketh only [*Chriſts full ſatisfaction for Sin*,to be the *Impulſive-External*, *Meritorious*, and *Material Cauſe*; as being that which is imputed to us; and the *Form* of Juſtification to be the *Remiſſion of Sin*, *Original* and *Actual*, or the *Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs* (which he maketh to be all one) *or the Imputation of Faith for* Righteouſneſs].

Saith Biſhop *Downame* of Juſtif. p. 305. [To be *Formally Righteous by Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed, never any of us, for ought I know, affirmed.* The like ſaith Dr. *Prideaux*, when yet very many Proteſtants affirm it.

Should I here ſet together forty or ſixty Definitions of Proteſtants verbatim, and ſhew you how much

much they differ, it would be unpleasant, and tedious, and unnecessary.

And as to those same Divines that Dr. *Tully* nameth as agreed, Dr. *Davenants* and Dr. *Fields* words I have cited at large in my *Confes.* saying the same in substance as I do; as also Mr. *Scudders*, and an hundred more, as is before said.

And let any sober Reader decide this Controversie between us, upon these two further Considerations.

1. Peruse all the *Corpus Confessionum*, and see whether all the Reformed Churches give us a Definition of Justification, and agree in that Definition: Yea, whether the Church of *England* in its Catechism, or its Articles, have any proper Definition: Or if you will call their words a *Definition*, I am sure it's none but what I do consent to. And if a *Logical Definition* were by the Church of *England* and other Churches held *necessary* to Salvation, it would be in their Catechisms (if not in the Creed): Or if it were held necessary to Church-Concord, and Peace, and Love, it would be in their Articles of Religion, which they subscribe.

2. How can all Protestants agree of the *Logical Definition* of Justification, when 1. They agree not of the sense of the word [*Justifie,*] and of the *species* of that Justification which *Paul* and *James* speak of? Some make Justification to include Pardon and Sanctification, (see their words in *G. Forbes*, and *Le Blank*); many say otherwise. Most say that *Paul* speaketh most usually of Justification in *sensu forensi*, but whether it include [*Making just*] as some say, or only [*Judging just*] as others, or *Nolle punire*, be the act as Dr. *Twisse*, they agree not. And some hold that in *James Justification* is that

that which is *coram hominibus*, when ſaid to be by *Works*; but others (*truly*) ſay, it is that *coram Deo*.

2. They are not agreed in their very *Logical Rules*, and Notions, to which their Definitions are reduced; no not ſo much as of the number and nature of Cauſes, nor of *Definitions* (as is aforeſaid): And as I will not undertake to prove that all the Apoſtles, Evangeliſts and Primitive Paſtours, knew how to define *Efficient*, *Material*, *Formal* and *Final Cauſes* in *general*, ſo I am ſure that *all* good Chriſtians do not.

3. And when *Juſtification* is defined by Divines, is either the *Actus Juſtificantis*, and this being in the predicament of Action, what wonder if they diſagree about the *Material* and *Formal Cauſes* of it?

Nay, it being an Act of God, there are few Divines that tell us what that Act is: *Deus operatur per eſſentiam:* And *Ex parte agentis*, his Acts are his *Eſſence*, and all but one. And who will thus diſpute of the Definition and Cauſes of them, Efficient, Material, Formal, Final? when I preſumed to declare, that this Act of Juſtifying is not an immanent Act in God, nor without a Medium, but Gods Act by the Inſtrumentality of his *Goſpel-Covenant* or *Promiſe*, many read it as a new thing; and if that hold true that the Firſt Juſtification by Faith, is that which Gods Goſpel-Donation is the Inſtrument of, as the *Titulus ſeu Fundamentum Juris*, being but a *Virtual* and not an Actual Sentence, then the Definition of it, as to the Cauſes, muſt differ much from the moſt common Definitions.

But

But most Protestants say that *Justification* is *Sententia Judicis*. (And no doubt but there are three several *sorts* or Acts called Justification, 1. Constitutive by the *Donative Covenant*, 2. *Sentential*, 3. *Executive.*) And here they are greatly at a loss, for the decision of the Case, *what Act of God this Sententia Judicis* is. What it will be after death, we do not much disagree: But what it is immediately upon our believing. It must be an *Act* as in *patiente*, or the Divine essence denominated from such an *effect*. And what Judgment and Sentence God hath upon our believing, few open, and fewer agreee. Mr. *Tombes* saith it is a *Sentence* in *Heaven notifying* it to the Angels: But that is not all, or the chief: some run back to an Immanent Act; most leave it undetermined: And sure the *Name* of *Sentence* in general, signifieth no true Conception of it at all, in him that knoweth not what that *Sentence* is, seeing Universals are *Nothing* (out of us) but as they exist in individuals. Mr. *Lawson* hath said that which would reconcile Protestants, and some Papists, as to the Name, *viz.* that Gods *Execution* is his *Sentence*; He *Judgeth* by *Executing*: And so as the chief punishment is the *Privation of the Spirit*, so the Justifying Act, is the *executive donation* of the Spirit. Thus are we disagreed about *Active Justification* (which I have oft endeavoured Conciliatorily fullier to open.)

And as to *Passive Justification* (or as it is *Status Justificati*) which is indeed that which it concerneth us in this Controversie to open, I have told you how grosly some describe it here before. And all agree not what *Predicament* it is in: some take it to be in that of *Action*, *ut recipitur in passo*; and some in that of Quality and Relation Conjunct: But most

place

place it in Relation; And will you wonder if all Christian Women, yea or Divines, cannot define that Relation aright. And if they agree not in the notions of the *Efficient*, *Material*, *Formal and Final Causes*, of that which must be *defined* (as it is capable) by its *subjectum*, *fundamentum* and *terminus*.

I would not wish that the Salvation of any Friend of mine (or any one) should be laid on the true Logical Definition of Justification, Active or Passive, *Constitutive*, *Sentential* or *Executive*.

And now the Judicious will see, whether the Church and Souls of Men be well used by this pretence, that all Protestants are agreed in the *Nature*, *Causes* and Definition of Justification; and that to depart from that *one* Definition (where is it?) is so dangerous as the Doctor pretendeth, because the *Definition* and the *Definitum* are the same.

§ XX. P. 34. You say [*You tremble not in the audience of God and Man to suggest again that hard-fronted Calumny*, viz. *that I prefer a Majority of Ignorants before a Learned man in his own profession.*

Answ. I laid it down as a Rule, that *They are not to be preferred*: You assault that Rule with bitter accusations, as if it were unsound (or else to this day I understand you not.) Is it then [*a hard-fronted Calumny*] to defend it, and to tell you what is contained in the denying of it. *The audience of God* must be so dreadful to (you and) me, that (without calling you to consider whether the Calumny be not notoriously yours) I heartily desire any judicious person to help me to see, that I am here guilty, if it be so. But you add,

"[You

" [*You know not what the Event of all this may be:*
" *For suppose now, being drag'd in my Scarlet, (a habit*
" *more suitable for him that Triumphs) at the Wheel of*
" *your Chariot in the view of all men, I should happen to*
" *be degraded and turned out of my literate Society;*
" *would it not trouble you? no doubt: but then it might*
" *happen to be too late.*

Answ. 1. It would trouble me: because (though I know you not) our fame here saith that you are an *honest*, and *very modest man*, and those that are Nicknamed *Calvinists* prefer you before most others of your rank. But alas, what is Man, and what may Temptation do?

2. did you think that your *Scarlet* or *Mastership* did allow you to write copiously, as you did, against your Neighbour who never medled with you, and made it a crime in him, whom you accuse, to defend himself, and a righteous cause? I see in this age we deal on hard unequal terms with some Men that can but get into Scarlet.

3. You would make your Reader believe by these words that you are really Melancholly, and fear where no fear is. A Reverend Doctor, whose Book hath the Patronage of one of the greatest Bps. *of England* writeth against one of no *Academical degree*, who hath these 13. years and more been judged unworthy to preach to the most ignorant Congregation in the Land, and by the (Contrived) distinction of *Nonconformists* from *Conformists*, goeth under the *scorn* and *hatred* of *such*, as you pretend to be in danger of, and hath himself no security for his liberty in the open Air; that this Learned man in his honour, should conceit that an Answer from this hated person might endanger his degradation and turning

turning out of his place, is ſo ſtrange a fancie, as will make your Readers wonder.

4. But whether you are Melancholly or no I know not; but if you are not *unrighteous*, I know not what *unrighteouſneſs* is. Will you bear with the diverſion of a ſtory?

When the *Moors* were ſentenced to ruin in *Spain*, one of the Diſciples of *Valdeſſo* (a Scholar) fell into the diſpleaſure of the Bp. of *Toledo*: A Neighbour Doctor knowing that the Bps. favour might beſtead him —— (whether accidentally or contrivedly I know not) hit upon this happy courſe: The Scholar and he being together in a ſolemn Convention, the Scholar was taking Tobacco, and the Dr. ſeeing the ſmok threw firſt a Glaſs of Beer in his face, and cryed *Fire*, *Fire*; The Scholar wiped his face, and went on; The Doctor next threw an *Ink-bottle in his Face*, crying ſtill *Fire*, *Fire*; The Scholar being thus blackt, perceived that he was like to be taken for a *Moor*, and ruined, and he went out and carefully waſh'd his face: the Doctor charged him openly for affronting him (yea and injuriouſly calumniating him) by the fact: For ſaith he, there was neceſſary Cauſe for what I did: There is no ſmoak without ſome fire: that which fired you might next have fired the Houſe, and that the next Houſe, and ſo have burnt down all the City: and your action intimateth as if I had done cauſeleſly what I did, and done you wrong: The Scholar anſwered him; I knew not, Sir, that it was unlawful to waſh me, but I will take no more Tobacco that I may no more offend you; But if in this froſty weather the *thickneſs* of my *breath* ſhould be called *ſmoak*, may I not waſh my face, if you again caſt your Ink upon it?

No, saith the Doctor, It is not you, nor any private man that must be judg whether you are on Fire or not, in a publick danger: Must the City be hazarded, if you say that it is not Fire? The Scholar asketh, may I not refer the case to the standers-by, and wash my face if they say, It was no Fire? No, saith the Dr. that is but to call in your Associates to your help, and to add *Rebellion* and *Schism* to your disobedience: I perceive what principles you are of. Why then, saith the Scholar, if I must needs be a *Moor*, my face and I are at your mercy.

But pardon this digression, and let you and I stand to the judgment of any righteous and competent Judge, whether you deal not with me in notorious injustice, so be it the Case be truly stated.

The person whom you assaulted is one, that attempted (with success) the subversion of Antinomianism and the clearing of truth; their Ignorance of which was the Cause of their other Errours. But having let fall, (for want of use in writing) some incongruous words (as *Covenant* for *Law*, &c.) and that somewhat often, and some excepting against the Book, he craved their animaversions, and promised to suspend the Book till it were corrected; and purposely wrote a far greater Volumn in explication of what was dark, and defence of what was wrongfully accused, and many other Volumns of full defence: No man answereth any of these: but after twenty years, or thereabout, (though I protested in print against any that would write against the Aphorisms, without regard to the said Explications) you publish your Confutation of part of those Aphorisms, and that with most notorious untruth, charging me to deny *all Imputation of Christs Righteousness*, when

when I had there profeſt the Contrary, and taking no notice of any after-explication or defence, and parallelling me with *Bellarmine*, if not with Hereticks or Infidels (for I ſuppoſe you take the denyers of *all Imputation* to be little better.) This Book you publiſh without the leaſt provocation with other quarrels, dedicating it to that R. Rd. B. who firſt ſilenced me; (as if I muſt go write over again all the Explications and Defences I had before written, becauſe you (that are bound to accuſe me) are not bound to read them:) and this you do againſt one that at that time had been about 13 years ſilenced, ejected, and deprived of all Miniſterial maintenance, and of almoſt all his own perſonal Eſtate, deſiring no greater preferment than leave to have preached for nothing, where is notorious neceſſity, could I have obtained it, ſometimes laid in the common Jail among Malefactors, for preaching in my own houſe, and *dwelling within five miles of it*: after fined at forty pound a Sermon for preaching for nothing; looking when my *Books* and *Bed* are taken from me by diſtreſs, though I live in conſtant pain and langour, the Conſtable but yeſterday coming to have diſtrained for ſixty pound for two Sermons; hunted and hurryed about to Juſtices at the will of any ignorant—— Agent of—— that will be an Informer, and even fain to keep my doors daily lockt, if it may be to ſave my Books a while: Yet the exciting of wroth by *publick Caluminy* againſt one ſo low already, and under the perſecuting wrath of *your friends*, was no fault, no injuſtice in you at all! (nor indeed did I much feel it.)

But for me who am thus publickly by *viſible Calumny* traduced, truly to tell you where you miſtake,

and how you wrong Gods Church and Truth more than me, and if also I offer peaceably to wash my own face, this is *hard fronted Calumny, dragging* a Doctor in *Scarlet at the Wheels of my Chariot, which might occasion his degrading and turning out, &c.*

This over-tenderness of your honour as to other mens words, (and too little care of the means of it, as to your own) hath a cause that it concerneth you to find out. Had you the tenth part as many Books written against you, as are against me (by Quakers, Seekers, Infidels, Antinomians, Millenaries, Anabaptists, Separatists, Semi-separatists, Papists, Pseudo-Tilenus, Diocesans, Conformists, and many Enemies of Peace, (to whom it was not I, but your self that joyned you) it would have hardened you into some more patience. If you will needs be militant you must expect replies: And he that will injuriously speak to the World what he should not speak, must look to hear what he would not hear. But you add;

Sir, the Name and Quality of a DOCTOR and Master of a Literate Society, might have been treated more civilly by you.

Answ. 1. I am ready to ask you forgiveness for any word that any impartial man (yea or your Reverend Brethren of that Academy themselves, whom I will allow to be *somewhat partial* for you) shall notifie to me to be uncivil or any way injurious. 2. But to be free with you, neither Doctorship, Mastership nor Scarlet will Privileg you to fight against *Truth, Right*, and *Peace*, and to vent gross mistakes, and by *gross untruths in matter of fact*, such as is your [*Omnem ludibrio habet imputationem*] to abuse your poor Brethren, and keep the long-con-

conſuming flames ſtill burning, by falſe repreſenting thoſe as Popiſh, and I know not what, who ſpeak not as unaptly as your ſelf, and all this without contradiction. Were you a Bp. my *Body* and *Eſtate* might be in your power, but *Truth*, *Juſtice* and the *Love of Chriſtians*, and the *Churches peace*, ſhould not be cowardly betrayed by me on pretenſe of reverence to your Name and Quality. I am heartily deſirous that for ORDER-ſake the *Name* and *Honour* of my Superiours may be very reverently uſed. But if they will think that *Errour*, *Injuſtice*, and *Confuſion* muſt take ſanctuary under bare *Eccleſiaſtical* or *Academical Names* and robes, they will find themſelves miſtaken: Truth and Honeſty will conquer when they paſs through Smithfield flames: Priſons confine them not; Death kills them not; No ſiege will force an honeſt Conſcience by famine to give up. He that *cannot endure* the ſight of his own excrements muſt not diſh them up to another mans Table, leſt they be ſent him back again. And more freedom is allowed againſt *Peace-Breakers* in *Frays* and *Wars*, than towards men that are in a quieter ſort of Controverſie.

§ XX. P. 36. 37. You ſay [*For your various Definitions of Juſtification, Conſtitutive, Sentential, Executive, in Foro Dei, in foro Conſcientiæ, &c.——— What need this heap of diſtinctions here, when you know the queſtion betwixt us is of no other Juſtification, but the Conſtitutive in foro Dei, that which maketh us righteous in the Court of Heaven? I have nothing to do with you yet in any elſe, as your own Conſcience will tell you when you pleaſe: If you have not more Juſtice and civility for your intelligent Readers, I wiſh you*

would shew more Compassion to your Ignorant Homagers, and not thus abuse them with your palpable Evasions.

Answ. Doth the question, *Whether the several sorts of Justification will bear one and the same Definition*, deserve all this anger (and the much greater that followeth)?

1. Seeing I am turned to my Reader, I will crave his impartial judgment: I never *received* and *agreed on* a state of the question with this Doctor: He writeth against my books: In those Books I over and over and over distinguish of Justification, *Constitutive*, *Sentential*, and *Executive* (besides those subordinate sorts, by *Witness*, *Evidence*, *Apology*, &c.) I oft open their differences: He writeth against me, as *denying* all *Imputation* of *Christs Righteousness*, and holding *Popish Justification by works*, and never tells me whether he take the word [*Justification*] in the same sense that I do, or in which of those that I had opened: And now he passionately appealeth to my Conscience that *I knew his sence*: What he saith [*my Conscience will tell me*] it is not true: It will tell me no such thing: but the clean contrary, that even after all his *Disputes* and *Anger*, and these *words*, I profess I know not what he meaneth by [*Justification.*]

2. What [*Constitutive in foro Dei, that which maketh us Righteous in the Court of Heaven*] meaneth with him, I cannot conjecture. He denyeth not my Distinctions, but saith, *what need they:* I ever distingnished *Making Righteous*, *Judging Righteous*. *Executively useing as Righteous:* The first is in *our selves*; The second is by Divines said to be *in foro Dei*, an act of Judgment; the third is *upon us* after both:

both: now he seemeth to confound the *two first*, and yet denyeth not their difference; and saith, he meaneth [*Constitutive in foro:*] He that is *made Righteous* is such *in se*; and as such is *Justifiable in foro*:] We are *Made Righteous by God* as free *Donor* and *Imputer*, antecedently to judgment: We are *in foro sentenced Righteous by God as Judg*: so that this by *sentence* presupposeth the former: God never *Judgeth us Righteous* and Justifieth us against *Accusation*, till he have first *Made us Righteous* and *Justified us from* adherent Guilt by *Pardon and Donation*. Which of these meaneth he? I ask not my *Ignorant homagers* who know no more than I, but *his Intelligent Reader*. He taketh on him to go the Commonest way of Protestants: And the Commonest way is to acknowledg that a *Constitutive Justification*, or making *the man Just*, (antecedent to the *Actus forensis*) must need go first: but that it is the *second* which *Paul* usually meaneth, which is the *actus forensis*, the *sentence of the Judg in foro*, contrary to *Condemnation*: And doth the Doctor think that to *make Righteous* and to *sentence* as *Righteous* are all one? and that we are *made Righteous in foro* otherwise than to be *just* in *our selves*, and so *Justifiable in foro*, before the *Sentence*? or do Protestants take the *Sentence* to be *Constituting or Making us Righteous*? All this is such talk as had I read it in Mr. *Bunnyan* of the Covenants, or any of my *Ignorant Homagers*, I should have said, the Author *is a stranger to the Controversie, into which he hath rashly plunged himself*: but I have more reverence to so learned a man, and therefore blame my dull understanding.

3. But what if I had known (as I do not yet) what sort of Justification he meaneth? Doth he not

know that I was then debating the Case with him, whether the *Logical Definitions* of *Justification*, *Faith*, &c. are not a work of Art, in which a *few well-studied judicious Divines* (these were my words) *are to be preferred before Authority, or Majority of Votes.* And Reader, what Reason bound me to confine this Case, to *one only sort* of *Justification*? And why, (I say, *why*) must I confine it to a *sort* which Dr. *Tully meaneth*, when my *Rule and Book* was written *before his*, and when to this day I know not what he meaneth? Though he at once chide at my Distinguishing, and tell me that *All Protestants agree* in the *Nature*, *Causes*, and *Definition*, (and if all agreed, I might know by *other Mens words* what *he* meaneth) yet to all before-said, I will add but one contrary Instance of many.

Cluto, in his very *Methodical* but unsound *Idea Theol.* (signalized in *Voetii Biblioth.*) defineth Justification so, as I suppose, best pleaseth the Doctor, *viz.* [*Est Actio Dei Judicialis, qua redemptos propter passiones justitiæ Divinæ satisfactorias a Christo sustentatas, redemptisque imputatas, a peccatis puros, & consequenter a pœnis liberos, itemque propter Obedientiam a Christo Legi Divinæ præstitam redemptisque imputatam, justitia præditos, & consequenter vita æterna dignos, ex miserecordia pronunciat*]. In the opening of which he telleth us, *pag.* 243. (against multitudes of the greatest Protestants Definitions.) [*Male alteram Justificationis partem, ipsam Justitiæ Imputationem statui, cum Justificatio non sit ipsa Imputatio, sed Pronunciatio quæ Imputatione, tanquam fundamento facto, nititur.*

And

And he knew no ſenſe of Juſtification, but [*Vel ipſam ſententiæ Juſtificatoriæ in mente Divina prolationem, ſive Conſtitutionem, vel ejus in Cordibus redemptorum manifeſtantem Revelationem* : And ſaith, *Priori modo factum eſt autem omnem fidem; cum Deus omnes, quibus paſſiones & juſtitiam Chriſti imputabat, innocentes & juſtos reputaret, cum ejus inimici, adeoque ſine fide eſſent,* (ſo that here is a Juſtification of Infidels, as innocent for Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed to them): *Quare etiam ut jam facta fide apprehendenda eſt.* The ſecond which follows Faith, is Faith, *ingenerating a firm perſwaſion of it.* Is not here ſad defining, when *neither of theſe* are the Scripture-*Juſtification* by *Chriſt* and *Faith* ?

And ſo §. 32. the *time* of Juſtification by Faith he maketh to be the time when we receive the *feeling* of the former: And the time of the former is preſently after the *Fall*; of all at once: And hence gathereth that [*Ex eo quod Juſtificatio dicitur fieri propter paſſiones & obedientiam Chriſti, quibus ad perfectionem nihil deeſt, nobis imputatas* (before Faith or Birth) *conſequitur innocentiam & juſtitiam in Redemptis quam primum perfectas & ab omni macula puras eſſe*——] and ſo that neither the pronunciation in *mente Divina*, or imputation *ullis gradibus ad perfectionem exſurgat.*

But what is this pronunciation in *mente Divina?* He well and truly noteth, §. 29. that [*Omnes actiones Divinæ, ſi ex eo æſtimentur quod re ipſa in Deo ſunt, idem ſunt cum ipſo Deo, ideoque dependentiam a Cauſa externa non admittant: Si tamen conſiderentur quoad rationem formalem hujus vel illius denominationis ipſis impoſitæ in relatione ad Creaturas conſiſtentem, ipſis cauſæ impulſivæ aſſignare poſ-*

ſunt

ſunt, &c. This diſtinction well openeth, how God may be ſaid to *juſtifie in His own Mind:* But what is that effect, *Unde eſſentia vel mens Divina ita denominatur juſtificans?* Here he is at a loſs, neither truly telling us what is *Juſtication Conſtitutive, Sentential*, nor *Executive* (but in the little part of [*Feeling*] *Gods ſecret Act*) yet this dark Definer truly ſaith [*Ex ſenſu Scripturæ veriſſime affirmetur hominem per fidem ſolam juſtificari, quia ex noſtra parte nihil ad Juſtificationem conferendum Deus requirit, quam ut Juſtificationem in Chriſto fundatam credamus, & fide non producamus, ſed recipiamus.*

If yet you would ſee whether all Proteſtants agree in the Definition of Juſtification, read the multitude of Definitions of it in ſeveral ſenſes; in Learnrd *Alſtedius* his *Definit. Theol. c.* 24. §. 2. pag. 97. &c. [*Juſtificatio hominis coram Deo eſt qua homo in foro Divino abſolvitur, ſeu juſtus eſſe evincitur contra quemvis actorem, Deo ipſo judice, & pro eo ſententiam ferente*]. But what is this *Forum? Forum Divinum eſt ubi Deus ipſe judicis partes agit, & fert ſententiam ſecundum leges a ſe latas?* But where is that *Eſt internum vel externum? Forum divinum internum eſt in ipſa hominis Conſcientia, in qua Deus Throuum juſtitiæ erigit in hac vita ibi agendo partes actoris & judicis: Forum Conſcientiæ.* (But it is not *this* that is meant by the *Juſtification by Faith*). *Forum divinum externum eſt, in qua Deus poſt hanc vitam extra hominem exercet judicium,* 1. *Particulare*, 2. *Univerſale.* This is true and well: But are we no where Juſtified by Faith but in *Conſcience*, till after Death? This is by not conſidering, 1. The *Jus ad impunitatem & vitam donatum*

datum per fœdus Evangelicum upon our Believing, which ſuppoſing *Faith* and *Repentance* is our *Conſtitutive Juſtification*, (*virtually* only *ſentential*). 2. And the Judgment of God begun in this Life, pronounced ſpecially by *Execution*. Abundance of uſeful Definitions ſubordinate you may further there ſee in *Alſtedius*, and ſome wrong, and the chief omitted.

The vehement paſſages of the Doctors Concluſion I paſs over; his deep ſenſe of *unſufferable Provocations*, I muſt leave to himſelf; his warning of the *dreadful Tribunal* which I am near, it greatly concerns me to regard: And Reader, I ſhall think yet that his Conteſt (though troubleſome to me that was falſly aſſaulted, and more to him whoſe detected Miſcarriages are ſo painful to him) hath yet been *Profitable* beyond the Charges of it to *him or me*, if I have but convinced thee, that 1. *Sound mental Conceptions of ſo much as is neceſſary to our own Juſtification, much differ from proper Logical Definitions: And that*, 2. *Many millions are Juſtified that cannot define it*: 3. *And that Logical Definitions are Works of Art more than of Grace, which require ſo much Acuteneſs and Skill, that even worthy and excellent Teachers may be, and are diſagreed about them, eſpecially through the great ambiguity of Words; which all underſtand not in the ſame ſence, and few are ſufficiently ſuſpicious of, and diligent to explain.* 4. *And* therefore that our Chriſtian *Love*, *Peace*, and *Concord*, *ſhould not* be laid *upon ſuch Artificial* things. 5. And that *really* the *Generality* of *Proteſtants* are agreed moſtly in the *Matter*, when they quarrel ſharply about many Artificial Notions and Terms in the point of Juſtification.

tion. (And yet after all this, I ſhall as earneſtly as this Doctor, deſire and labour for *accurateneſs in Diſtinguiſhing*, *Defining* and *Method*, though I will not have ſuch things to be Engins of Church-Diviſion.)

And laſtly, Becauſe he ſo *oft* and earneſtly preſſeth me with his *Quem quibus*, *who is the Man*, I *profeſs* I dreamed not of *any particular Man*: But I will again tell you whom my Judgment magnifies in this Controverſie above all others, and who truly tell you *how far Papiſts and Proteſtants agree*, viz. *Vinc. le Blanc*, and *Guil. Forbes*, (I meddle not with his *other Subjects*), *Placeus* (in Theſ. Salmur.) *Davenant*, Dr. *Field*, Mr. *Scudder* (his daily Walk, fit for all families) Mr. *Wotton*, Mr. *Bradſhaw*, and Mr. *Gataker*, Dr. *Preſton*, Dr. *Hammond*, (*Pract. Cat.*) and Mr. *Lawſon* (in the main) Abundance of the French and Breme Divines are alſo very clear. And though I muſt not provoke him again by naming ſome *late Engliſh* men, to reproach them by calling them *my diſciples*, I will venture to tell the plain man that loveth not *our wrangling tedioufneſs*, that *Mr. Trumans Great Propit.* and Mr. *Gibbons ſerm. of Juſtif.* may ſerve him well without any more.

And while this worthy Doctor and I do both concord with ſuch as *Davenant* and *Field* as to *Juſtification by Faith or Works*, judg whether we differ between our ſelves as far as he would perſwade the World, who agree *in tertio*? And whether as he hath angrily profeſt his concord in the two other Controverſies which he raiſed (*our Guilt of nearer Parents ſin, and our preferring the judgment of the wiſeſt*, &c.) it be not likely that he will do ſo alſo

in

in this, when he hath leiſure to read and know what it is that I ſay and hold, and when we both underſtand our ſelves and one another. And whether it be a work worthy of *Good* and *Learned* men, to allarm Chriſtians againſt one another for the ſake of arbitrary words and notions (which one partly uſeth leſs aptly and skilfully than the other) in matters wherein they really agree.

2 Tim. 2. 14. *Charging them before the Lord that they ſtrive not about words, to no profit, but to the ſubverting of the Hearers (yet) ſtudy to ſhew thy ſelf approved unto God, a workman that need not be aſhamed, rightly dividing the word of Truth*

Two Sparks more quenched, which fled after the rest from the Forge of Dr. Tho. Tully.

§. 1.

DId I not find that ſome Mens *Ignorance* and *factious Jealouſie* is great enough to make them combuſtible Recipients of ſuch Wildfire as thoſe *Strictures* are; and did not *Charity* oblige me to do what I have here done, to ſave the aſſaulted Charity of ſuch Perſons, more than to ſave any Reputation of my own, I ſhould repent that I had written one Line in anſwer to ſuch *Writings* as I have here had to do with: I have been ſo wearied with the haunts of the like Spirit, in Mr. *Crandon*, Mr. *Bagſhaw*, Mr. *Danvers*, and others, that it is a work I have

have not patience to be much longer in, unleſs it were more neceſſary.

Two ſheets more tell us that the Doctor is yet angry; And little that's better that I can find. In the firſt, he ſaith again, that [*I am buſie in ſmoothing my way where none can ſtumble in, a thing never queſtioned by him, nor by any Man elſe, he thinks, who owns the Authority of the ſecond Commandment*]. And have I not then good Company and Encouragement not to change my Mind?

But, 1. He feigneth a Caſe ſtated between him and me, who never had to do with him before, but as with others in my Writings, where I ſtate my Caſe my ſelf. 2. He never ſo much as toucheth either of my Diſputations of *Original Sin*, in which I ſtate *my Caſe* and *defend* it. 3. And he falſly feigneth the Caſe ſtated, in words (and he ſuppoſeth in a ſenſe) that I never had do do with: Saying, [*I charge you with a new ſecondary Original Sin, whoſe Pedegree is not from* Adam: *I engage not a ſyllable further*]. And pag. 8. [*You have aſſerted that this Novel Original Sin is not derived from our Original Father; no line of Communication between them; a ſin beſides that which is derived from* Adam,

as

as you plainly and poſſitively affirm]. I never ſaid that it had no *Pedegree*, no line of *Communication*, no kind of derivation from *Adam*. 4. Yea, if he would not touch the Diſputation where I ſtate my Caſe, he ſhould have noted it as ſtated in the very Preface which he writeth againſt; and yet there alſo he totally overlooketh it, though opened in divers Propoſitions. 5. And the words in an Epiſtle to another Mans Book, which he faſteneth ſtill on were theſe; [*Over-looking the Intereſt of Children in the Actions of their nearer Parents, and think that they participate of no Guilt, and ſuffer for no Original Sin, but* Adams *only*]. And after, [*They had more Original Sin than what they had from* Adam]. 6. He tells me, that [*I ſeem not to underſtand my own Queſtion, nor to know well how to ſet about my Work*]; and he will teach me how to manage the *Buſineſs* that *I have undertaken*, and ſo he tells me *how* I MUST ſtate the Queſtion hereafter, (ſee his words). Reader, ſome Reaſons may put a better Title on this Learned Doctors actions; but if ever I write at this rate, I heartily deſire thee to caſt it away as utter DISHONESTY and IMPUDENCE.

It

It troubleth me to trouble thee with Repetitions. I hold, 1. That *Adams* Sin is imputed (as I opened) to his Posterity. 2. That the degree of Pravity which *Cains* nature received from *Adam*, was the dispositive enclining Cause of all his Actual Sin: 3. But not a necessitating Cause of *all those* Acts; for he might possibly have done less evil and more good than he did. 4. Therefore not the *Total principal Cause*; for *Cains free-will* was *part* of that. 5. *Cains actual sin increased* the *pravity* of his *nature*. 6. And *Cains Posterity* were (as I opened it) *guilty* of *Cains actual sin*; and their *Natures* were the more *depraved* by his *additional pravity*, than they would have been by *Adams sin alone* (unless *Grace preserved* or *healed* any of them).

The Doctor in this Paper, would make his Reader believe that he is [*for no meer Logomachies*] and that the difference is not in *words only*, but *the thing*. And do you think that he differeth from me in any of these Propositions, or how this *sin is derived from* Adam? Yet this now must be the Controversie *de re*.

Do you think (for I must go by *thinking*) that he holdeth any other *Derivation* than this? Or did I ever deny any of this?

But it is vain to ſtate the Caſe to him: He will over-look it, and tell me what I *ſhould have* held, that he may not be thought to make all this Noiſe for nothing.

He ſaith *pag.* 8. [*If it derive in a direct line from the firſt Tranſgreſſion, and have its whole Root faſtened there, what then? why then ſome words which he ſets together are not the beſt ſenſe that can be ſpoken.* It is then but *words*, and yet it is the *thing*: What he may mean by [a *direct Line*], and what by [*whole Root faſtened*] I know not; but I have told the World oft enough *what I mean*; and what *he meaneth*, I have little to do with.

But if he think, 1. That *Adams Perſon* did commit the ſin of *Cain*, and of all that ever were ſince committed; and that *Judas his act*, was *Adams perſonal act*. 2. Or that *Adams ſin* was a *total* or *neceſſitating* Cauſe of all the evil ſince committed; ſo do not I, (nor doth he, I doubt not). And now I am caſt by him on the ſtrait, either to accuſe him of *differing de re*, and ſo of *Doctrinal errour*, or elſe that he knoweth not when the difference is *de re*, and when *de nomine*, but is ſo uſed to confuſion, that *Names and Things* do come promiſcuouſly into

into the Queſtion with him: And which of theſe to chuſe, I know not.

The Reader may ſee that I mentioned [*Actual Sin, and Guilt*]: And I think few will doubt, but *Adams* [*Actual ſin*, and *Cains*,] were divers; and that therefore, the *Guilt* that *Cains* Children had of *Adams* ſin and of *Cains* was not the ſame: But that *Cauſa cauſæ* is *Cauſa cauſati*, and ſo that all following Sin was *partly* (but *partly*) *cauſed* by *Adam's*, we ſhall ſoon agree.

He addeth that I muſt make good that *new Original Sin* (for he can make uſe of the word *New*, and therefore *made* it) *doth mutare naturam, as the Old doth. Anſ.* And how far it *changeth it*, I told him, and he taketh no notice of it: The *firſt ſin* changed Nature from *Innocent* into *Nocent*; the *Second* changeth it from *Nocent into more Nocent*: Doth he deny this? Or why muſt I prove any more? Or doth nothing but Confuſion pleaſe him?

3. He ſaith, I muſt prove that the *Derivation of Progenitors ſins is conſtant and neceſſary, not uncertain and contingent. Anſ.* Of this alſo I fully ſaid what I held, and he diſſembleth it all, as if I had never done it: And why muſt I prove more?

By what Law can he impoſe on me what to hold?

But really doth he deny that the *Reatus culpæ*, yea and *ad Pœnam*, the Guilt of near r Parents ſins is *neceſſarily* and *certainly* the *Childs*, though *Grace* may *pardon* it? If he do not, why doth he call on me to prove it? If he do confeſs the *Guilt*, and deny it *neceſſary*, when will he tell us what is the *Contingent uncertain Cauſe*? For we take a *Relation* (ſuch as *Guilt* is) *neceſſarily* to *reſult a poſito fundamento*.

§. 2. He next cavilleth at my Citations, about which I only ſay, either the Reader will peruſe the *cited words*, and *my words*, *which ſhew* to what *end I cited them* (to prove our *Guilt* of our *nearer Parents* ſins) or he will not. If he *will not*, I cannot expect that he *will read* a further *Vindication*: If *he will*, he *needeth not*.

§. 3. His ſecond *Spark* is *Animadverſions* on a ſheet of mine, before mentioned, which are ſuch as I am not willing to meddle with, ſeeing I cannot either *handle* them, or *name* them as the nature of them doth require, without offending him: And if what is here ſaid (of *Imputation* and *Re-*

pro-

preſentation) be not enough, I will add no more, nor write over and over ſtill the ſame things, becauſe a Man that will take no notice of the many Volumns which anſwer all his Objections long ago, will call for more, and will write his Animadverſions upon a ſingle Sheet that was written on another particular occaſion, and pretend to his diſcoveries of my Deceits from the *Silence* of that *Sheet*, and from my naming the *Antinomians*.

I only ſay, 1. If this Mans way of Diſputing were the *common way*, I would abhor *Diſputing*, and be aſhamed of the *Name*.

2. I do friendly deſire the Author of the *Friendly Debate*, Mr. *Sherlock*, and all others that would faſten ſuch Doctrines on the *Non-Conformiſts*, as a Character of the *Party*, to obſerve that this Doctor ſufficiently confuteth their partiality; and that their Academical Church-Doctors, are as *Confuſed*, as *Vehement* maintainers of ſuch expreſſions as they account moſt unſavoury, as any even of the *Independants* cited by them: Yea, that this Doctor would make us queſtion whether there be now any *Antinomians* among us, and ſo whether all the Conformiſts that have charged the Conformiſts,

yea,

yea or the *Sectaries*, with having among them Men of ſuch unſound Principles, have not wronged them, it being indeed the Doctrine of the Church of *England* which they maintain, whom I and others call *Antinomians* and *Libertines:* And I hope at leaſt the ſober and ſound *Non-Conformiſts* are Orthodox, when the vehementeſt *Sectaries* that calumniated my Sermon at *Pinners Hall*, are vindicated by ſuch a Doctor of the Church.

3. I yet conclude, that if this *One Mans Writings* do not convince the Reader, of the *Sin and Danger* of Allarming Chriſtians againſt one another, as Adverſaries to great and neceſſary Doctrines, on the account of meer *Words* not *underſtood*, for want of accurateneſs and skill in the expreſſive Art, *I take him to be utterly unexcuſable.*

Pemble Vind. Grat. p. 25. *It were ſomewhat if it were in Learning as it is in bearing of a Burthen; where many weak Men may bear that which One or few cannot: But in the ſearch of* Knowledg, *it fares as in diſcrying a thing afar off; where* one quick-ſight *will ſee further than a thouſand clear Eyes.*

FINIS.

I had not time to gather the *Errata* of any but the First Book: Correct *these Greater*, or you will misunderstand the Matter.

PAge, 27. Line 2. Read self, *the Act*. p. 54. l. 30. r. *at* obliging. p. 58. l. 20. for of r. or, p. 59. l. 1, and 2. r. who is *not*. p. 86. l. 32. for OURS r. OUR Righteousness. p. 88. l. 7. for Covenanted r. Connoted. p. 97. l. 31. r. *and* suffering. p. 103. l. 9, 10. for have us Holy, r. leave us unholy. p. 110. l. 10. for we, r. were. p. 111. l. *penult*. and p. 112. l. 5. and 19. for our, r. one. l. 21. for but, r. must. p. 115. l. 25. for raze out, r. rake up. p. 117. l. 18. r. personating Representation. p. 118. l. 2. for *Minister*, r. Meriter. p. 119. l. 16. for *are*, r. are *not*. p. 140. l. 23. for if, r. that. p. 126. l. 23. for arrive, r. arm. p. 149. l. 19. r. *and* the. p. 153. l. 23. r. *and* will. p. 154. l. 26. r. our own-innocency, it. p. 157. l. 29. r. Private, but. p. 169. l. 2. r. conditional. p. 177. l. 9. r. sufficiency. p. 181. l. 27. for argument, r. agreement.

The Lesser Errata.

PReface p. 3. l. 16. r. eternal. Contents, p. 2. l. 21. r. *Wotton*. p. 11. l. 4. for no, r. in. l. 17. r. prætendit. l. 27. r. sufficere. p. 12. l. 1. r. ficantur: l. 16. r. impetrando, l. *antipen*. r. Credimus. p. 13. l. 2. r. præcedit. p. 16. l. 26. r. Schlussel Burgius. p. 22. l. 9. for that, r. the p. 36. l. *antipen*. dele by. p. 55. l. 10. for no, r. not. p. 60. l. 15. for then, r. there. p. 64. l. 5. for of, r. or. p. 68. l. 28. r. *so* to. p. 80. l. 17. r. if you will *sontes*. p. 91. l. 20. dele *the*. p. 94. l. 2. for *but*, r. *as*. l. 11. dele *and*. p. 102. l. 1. r. per. p. 104. l. *antipen*. r. Albericus. p. 135. l. 20. r. prædictus. l. 23. r. aliquem. p. 112. l. 28. r. relatione. p. 116. l. 21. r. *fulfillers*. p. 120. l. 11. r. Vasquez. p. 150. l. 26. r. indebitæ. p. 167. l. 29. for if, r. is. p. 184. l. *penult*. for as, r. and.

In a Curſory view of ſome Pages, I ſince ſee theſe faults.

PReface, Page 8. Line 22. for and, r. as. Book 1. P. 172. l. 1. r. *is is true.*

Anſwer to the Letter, P. 93. l. ult. for Conformiſts, r. Nonconformiſts. Book 2. Part 3. P. 16. l. 20. for *tum*, r. *tu*. P. 54. l. 14. for apt, r. yet, l. 28. for produceth, r. proceedeth. P. 56. l. 13. for ſtill, r. not. P. 65. l. 13. for Guilt, r. Gift. Book 2. Part 1. P. 259. l. 8. r. *Cauſas*. P. 268. l. 4. for firſt, r. full. P. 269. l. 28. fore Jure, r. iu re.

And I muſt tell the Reader that it is ſo long ſince the Papers to Mr. *Cartwright* were written, that if there be any paſſage which in my later Writings I correct, I muſt deſire him to take the latter as my Judgment: For I am none of thoſe that pretend my Youthful Writings to be ſufficiently Accurate, much leſs Faultleſs, or that to avoid the Imputation of Mutability, profeſs to be no wiſer than I was between twenty and thirty Years ago. I find ſomewhat, Book 2. Part 3. P. 51, 52. which needeth this Explication, *viz.*

[*God as Judg of lapſed Man, when He was judging him, added an Act of Grace, which in ſeveral reſpects is*, 1. *A Promiſe*. 2. *A Deed of Gift*. 3. *An Act of Oblivion or univerſal conditional Pardon*. 4. *A Law*. 5. *And as it hath reſpect to* Chriſts abſolutely promiſed *and* foreſeen Merits, *it may be ſaid, to be* like *or* Equivolent *to an univerſal conditional Sentence: But taking the word* [Sentence] *ſtrictly as it is* [*a Sentence of the Individuals according to the Rule of a Law as kept or broken*], *ſo it is not properly a Sentence as to us* (*as is after proved.*)

May 26. 1652.

An Account of my Consideration of the Friendly, Modest, Learned Animadversions of Mr. *Chr. Cartwright* of *York*, on my Aphorisms.

Of God's Legislative and Decretive Will.

Aphor. as cited by Mr. *C.*

Page 2. THe *distinction of God's Will, into his Will of Purpose, and his Will of Precept, &c. It is near of Kin to the common distinction of* Voluntas signi & Beneplaciti, *but not the same.*

Mr. C's Animadversions.

I think it is the same as *Praeceptum* is called *Voluntas signi*, though some do not so clearly and fully explain this Distinction as others do.

R. B's Reply.

I am glad you begin with this Distinction, that I may have my apprehensions of it more fully cleared; where they are right, confirmed; and if unsound, that they may be changed. For I confess, I make use of this Distinction, as a Key to my understanding of very many points in Divinity, to which it is not commonly applied. The confounding of our Ethicks and Physicks, and so of their distinct Fountains, doth introduce confusion into the main Body of Theology, with those that are guilty of it: And it is easie to conceive, that it is necessary to the understanding of Theological Controversies, to avoid that confusion, and know to which of these the Question doth belong. It is easie to conceive what work it would make in *Philosophical* Discourses, to confound our *Physicks* and *Ethicks*; and it will have no better effect in *Theological*. Therefore, as I take *Debitum* to be the direct proper Object of our *Ethicks*; and *Ens Reale*, of our Physicks (for I take not the term [Physicks] in the common restrained sense, as its Object is *only Corpus Naturale*; but as it is ὀντολογία, as some call Metaphysicks, and containeth *much of Metaphysicks*, (for I conceive that which treateth *de Ente Reali* should be one entire Doctrine) *Pneumaticks*, and *common Physicks all*: So I take [*Ethicks*] in so large a sence, as to comprehend *Oeconomicks*, *Politicks*, and all *Morality*:) So I do distinguish of *God's Will* here, according to these *different Objects*. As *Ens Reale*, is the *Object*, or *Product* of his Will, for want of a better name, I call it, his *Decretive Will*, or *Will of Purpose*: And because in most of our Theological Discourses, we are fain to speak of God's

306:04

God's Will, according to the imperfect manner of mans will, as if it respected its Object as present, past, future; therefore *Res futuræ & Rerum futuritio* are usually made the Objects, or Products of God's *Decree* or *Purpose* (for man *purposeth* only *de futuro*:) (And indeed *quoad hominem*, the thing being *truly future*, so *God* may be said to *Decree* that *quoad hominem* it *shall be future*; though *quoad ipsum Deum non est futurum.*) But I sometime say, *Eventus* is the *Object* of *this Will*; meaning thereby *Res evenientes*, and so connecting the *Thing* with its Emanation from its first Cause; and intending the Comprehension of all Beings, past, present, and future. And also, that I may comprehend *Privations*, which as they are *Reductively* belonging to the Doctrine of *Beings*; so may they also to the *Object* of *God's Will de Eventu.* For as *mans Will* may be *de Agere vel non Agere, de esse vel non esse*; so we may conceive of *Gods Will*: (Though *Scotus* hath shewed the truth of this Conception to be very disputable.) Therefore when I say that *Ens Reale* is the *Object*, or *Product* of *this Will* of God, I mean both the *Esse & non Esse*, *Beings and Privations*; but one *directly* and *properly*, the other but *consequenter & reductivè*: As in saying *Debitum* is the *Object*, or rather *Product* of God's *Ethical*, or *Legislative Will*, I mean both the *Debere & non Debere*; but the former only *directly*, the latter but *indirectly*, *consequenter & reductivè*; as proceeding only from God's *not-commanding* or *prohibiting*, and properly being *Nothing*, and having *no Cause* in Morality: I mean, the [*Non-debeo agere*;] for in the [*Debeo non agere*] which is caused by *Prohibitions*, the *Debitum* is *Positive formaliter*, though

the *quasi subjecta materia, vel res debita*, be but *nominal*, and really *nothing*.

1. So that by God's *Decretive Will*, I mean only his *Will de Eventu, vel de Ente qua tali*; and by his *Legislative Will*, I mean only his *Will de Debito*: So that I primarily distinguish of the *Objects*, or *Products* of God's Will; and thence of *his Will it self*. This I expressed fully in my Aphorisms: So that my main scope is, but to keep open the difference between *Naturality*, and *Morality* in all our Discourses.

2. And I have there also manifested, that therefore I take the Act of Willing in God to be the same in both. *Velle Debitum*, is as properly *Velle*, as is *Velle Eventum*.

3. And that I distinguish of the Objects here, but *formaliter*: For *Debitum* is *Ens quoddam* (according to the common Doctrine: Though I think, as *Burgersdic. Metaph.* Relations are *inter entia & Nihil*:) But I mean therefore *Debitum qua Debitum*, & *Eventum qua Eventum*, *vel Ens qua Ens*.

God's Will is, 1. *De Ente in genere.* 2. *In specie*, 1. *De Ente Naturali.* 2. *De Ente Morali*; *i. e. De Jure vel debito.*

4. And therefore as the Doctrine *de Eventu vel de Ente*, is far more Comprehensive than the Doctrine *de Jure* (*Jus vel Debitum* being but an *inferior Species* of *Ens*; taking *Ens* so largely as to comprehend *Modalities* and *Relations:*) so *God's Will de Ente vel Eventu*, comprehendeth his Will *de Debito*: But yet *his Will de Debito, qua Debitum*, may well be distinguished from his *Will de Ente qua tali*; as the *Specifick* nature from the *Generical*.

5. I

5. I alſo (and principally) ſhewed you, that I comprehend two things in my phraſe of [*God's Legiſlative Will,*] or [*his Will de Debito:*] 1. The *Immanent Will* of God *de Debito*; which is as true, and as Eternal an Act, as his *Velle Eventum.* 2. The *ſignal Will* of God, which is *his Law*: This I told you, I call *his Will* but *Metonymically.*

6. Both theſe together, and neither alone, do *Conſtituere Debitum*; 1. Not God's *Immanent act alone*, or directly; for it is not properly *Lex*, till it be *ſignified*; much leſs *Lex promulgata.* 2. Nor the *Law*, or *ſignum* conſidered in it ſelf, abſtracted from the *Will ſignified*; but only conſidered *Formaliter ut ſignum*, and ſo with its correlate; *viz.* The *Immanent Will ſignified.*

7. My full meaning therefore is, but to diſtinguiſh *God's Law*, from his *other Acts and Works.* But I chooſe to call it [*his Legiſlative Will,*] rather than [*his Law:*] 1. Leſt it ſhould be thought I include only the *Law materially*, and exclude the *Immanent Will*, which was from Eternity *de Debito.* 2. Becauſe if I ſhould diſtinguiſh between [*God's Will,*] and [*his Law*] it would plainly ſound as if I contradiſtinguiſhed his *whole Will* from *his Law*, and ſo even his *Will de Debito*, which is the *Soul of his Law*, the *Signum* being but the *Body.*

8. And I fully told you, that therefore I call it his [*Legiſlative Will,*] rather than (as others hitherto) his [*Will of Precept,*] becauſe *the Law* hath *ſeveral parts*, which conſtitute a *ſeveral Debitum*: *Precept* is but *one* of theſe parts, but I ſpeak of *all.* The falſe Definitions of *Law* have long wronged the World; while men reduced it all to *Precept*,

or to be *Regula actionum moralium.* The Law determineth (in the large, and yet proper sence, as I will take Law) *de omni Debito, Moraliter & propriè sic dicto:* 1. What shall be *due from us*; that is, in the *Precept* and *Prohibition.* 2. What shall be *due to us*; that is, in, 1. The *Promise.* 2. The *Threat*: Besides *Fundamental Distributions.*

So that the Product of God's *Legislative Will*, is, 1. *Debitum rei libere & absolutè Donatæ.* 2. *Debitum officii nostri (in agendo & non-agendo.)* 3. *Debitum præmii.* 4. *Debitum pœnæ.*

Thus I have all close together, and once again told you my meaning (as plain as I can with brevity) in this Distinction. And understand, that I undertake not to shew you how far other mens sence of it is the same with mine: But our Question is, Whether this that I have opened, be the Schoolmens sence of their Distinction of [*Voluntas signi & Beneplaciti?*] I conclude, that it is not, and that for these *Reasons.*

1. *Implere & permittere naturaliter (ut à permissione morali distinguitur)* which are some of their *signa*, are utterly unreducible to this Legislative Will.

2. Both the terms of their Distinction, and their Explication, shew that they intend not to distinguish God's Will *ab objectis*; *Event and Right*: But as it is *in it self*, and as it is manifested to us: And therefore *Voluntas signi* with them, is *Voluntas significata*, or *signum Voluntatis*: But not one act of that Will signified as distinct from another (as to our apprehension;) but the same that is before termed *Voluntas Beneplaciti*, is it as signified. And therefore some of them do again subdistinguish their

five

five ſigns, noting, that ſome of them (*Præceptum, prohibitio, Conſilium*) do determine *Duty*; and the other ſignifie *Event*. So *Lombard* himſelf more fully and plainly than almoſt any of his followers; And ſo *Aquinas* and many more alſo do. And ſo they may as well ſubdiſtinguiſh the *Voluntas Beneplaciti*, into *Beneplacitum de Eventu, & de Debito*. I could by multitudes of their ſayings, manifeſt this that I ſay, of the plain importance of their words, were it not a vain loſs of time and labour, ſpecially to you that I know have ſo frequently read it.

Dist. 45. *l.* 1. So. *Durbellis in Sent. ibid. & Viguerius Inſtitut c.* 3. §. 1. *pag.* 22. *Aquin.* 1. 9. 19. *a.* 12. 3.

3. And therefore they uſe the Diſtinction of *Voluntas ſecreta & revelata*, as the ſame in ſence with *Beneplaciti & ſigni*: But it is not the ſame with *mine*; for *Voluntas de Eventu eſt partim ſecreta partim (in prophetiis & Cauſis ſecundis) revelata.*

4. And they plainly exclude the *Immanent Act of God's Will de Debito*, from their *Vol. ſigni*, by the very name. For the *Immanent Act* is not *ſui ipſius ſignum nec alterius.*

5. And as plainly do they exclude it by ſaying, that *Volunt. ſigni* is but *Metaphoricè God's Will*, Whereas the *Immanent Act* is *properly* his *Will*, and the *ſignum* is more *Metonymice* than *Metaphoricè* his *Will*. I think I needed no more proof; but if theſe convince you not, the matter is of very ſmall moment what *they* mean. Divers of our own more clear Divines indeed, do come near my meaning in their Diſtinction of *Vol. Præcepti & Propoſiti*: As Judicious *Davenant Diſſertat. de Redempt. Univerſ. pag.* 126. *Rivet. Exercit.* in *Gen.* 107. *pag.* (*mihi*)

524. *Vossius Hist. Pelag. l. 7. part. 1. Thes. 1. & 2. per tot. & in Thes. de Pelagianismo D. Chamier Panstrat. Tom. 3. l. 7. c 6. ad loc. 1 Tim. 2. & 2 Pet. 3. Conrad. Bergius Prax. Cathol. diss. 6. p.888. Zanchius* sometimes expresseth it one way, and sometimes near as I; as, *Tom. operum ult. p. (mihi) 679. & de Natura Dei, l. 3. c. 4. p. 257, 258. per tot. & 254.* Especially *Rutherford* (cited by you, who followeth *Twiss)* and *Camero pag. 642. Oper. in fol. Gen. cont. Tileu.* most plainly: And *Twiss* most frequently, *Vindic. Grat. l. 2. part. 1. Crim. 3. §. 1. & §. 11.* And Discovery of Dr. *Jackson's* Vanity, *ad §. 2. pag. 535, & p. 536, & 550.* And Consider. of *Tilenus* against *Synod. Dort. pag. 166. & Vindic. Grat. l. 2. part. 1. p. (Volum. minoris)* 173, 174. *Amyraldus Specim. Animadv. Special. p. 71.* Learned *Rob. Baronius* in *Philosoph. Theolog. Ancill. Exercit. 3. Art. 14. pag. 211.* And indeed the first that made me sensible that this Distinction differed from the School-distinction of [*Benepl. & signi,*] was *Twiss* and *Camero*: Yet it must be acknowledged, that *Twiss* himself (who makes more use of it than all others that I have read) overlooked (at least usually) the *Immanent Will of God de Debito*, and spake only of the *Precept* it self; and therefore calleth it God's Will *Metaphorically*. If I may prefer Truth before Modesty, I must say, that Dr. *Twiss* saw further into the nature and use of this Distinction than others before him had done; but yet his Notions were very imperfect of it, and his Improvement very short, in respect to its desert and use. And therefore he called it but *Voluntas Præcepti*, and applied it only to matter of *Precept and Prohibition*; but saw not that it belonged also to *Promise and Commination*,

Commination, even to the *whole Law*. And though he makes *Præcipere & Vetare* to be the Objects of of this Will (which clearly implies, that he took in the Immanent Act of which they were the Objects) *Lib.* 2. *part.* 1. *Crim.*3. §.11. yet he ſo often contradicteth it by ſpeaking otherwiſe, that I doubt it fell from him *ex improviſo*. One more let me name you, whom you muſt oppoſe with me, and that is *Molinæus Anato. Armin. c.*4. where he ſpeaks againſt them that call the *Decree* God's *Secret Will*, and the *Commandment* his *Revealed Will*, as ſpeaking inconſiderately. §. 8. & §. 9. he ſaith, Thomas *and the Schoolmen do diſtinguiſh God's Will into* Volun. Beneplaciti & Volunt. ſigni: *The members of which Diſtinction fall one into another*: *For many things of his* Vol. Beneplaciti, *are ſignified too*: *Neither is the word* Beneplaciti, *which is* in Gr. εὐδοκία, *ſufficiently applied here*; *For* εὐδοκία *doth for the moſt part include Love and Good-will*, &c. And §. 3, 4, 5. he well explains the *Legiſlative Will* in part. And he ſaw, §. 6, 7. that even *Promiſes* and *Threatnings* were reducible to it. But yet he thought it was improperly; and ſo §. 6, & 7. it is plain that he did not fully yet underſtand the due extent of this Will: Elſe; 1. He would have acknowledged the *Immanent Act*, as well as the *Signal*. 2. And have ſeen, that the *pars Legis præmians & puniens* (i.e. *Comminatio*) do as properly *Conſtituere Debitum præmii & pœnæ*, as the *Præceptum* doth the *Debitum officii*: and conſequently are moſt proper *ſigns* of *God's Will de Debito*. 3. And he would not have turned here to diſpute againſt *Conditional Will* in God; but would have ſeen, that God hath doubtleſs a *Conditional Law*, and ſo a *Conditional Will*

de

de Debito, whatever he hath *de Eventu*. But enough of mens Opinions. To proceed.

Aphor.

Pag. 3. *And indeed the Schoolmen do intend no other Will, but the same which they call* Beneplaciti; *whose Object is* Event, *as it is uncertainly represented to us by these signs*; (viz. *contained in that Verse*,

Præcipit ac prohibet, permittit, consulit, implet.)

And because they are such uncertain signs (the contrary to what they seem to import being oft certain) therefore they tell us that this is but Metaphorically called God's Will, &c.

Animadvers.

1. I do not see how *Impletio*, fulfilling; or *Operatio*, working, as *Aquin.* hath it, *Part.* 1. *q.* 19. *a.* 12. can be called an *uncertain sign*: For if God *fulfil*, or *work* a thing, it is a sure and undoubted sign that he doth *will it*. For he doth not work either against or besides his Will; so it is also in respect of *Permission*. For if God *permit* a thing to be done, it is certain that his Will is to have it done. *Non fit aliquid nisi omnipotens fieri velit, vel sinendo ut fiat, vel ipse faciendo.* Aug. Enchir. c. 95.

2. *Aquin.* indeed (*ibid.*) *a.* 11. makes *Volunt. signi* to be *Metaphorically* called *God's Will*; and so doth Dr. *Twiss*, yet he understood (and so I suppose did *Aquinas*) the Distinction so, as to be in effect all one with yours. *Voluntas signi propriè præceptum dicitur, improprie licet usitatè dicitur Voluntas. At Voluntas Beneplaciti Voluntas propriè dicta. Præcepta enim judicant quid Deus velit esse nostri officii ut à nobis fiat; non autem judicant quid sit decreti sui, ut ipse faciat, vel fieri permittat.* Dr. Twiss. Vind. l. 2. *digr.* 2. *c.* 13. *Voluntas signi Impropriè dicitur Voluntas: Significat enim tantum quid ab homine fieri debeat, aut quid placitum sit Deo, si fiat. At Voluntas Beneplaciti, propriè & simpliciter est Voluntas, quâ nempe decrevit, quid futurum sit, Deo aut efficiente, aut permittente.* Ibid. l. 1 part. 1. sect. 12. §. 2. Observe, that he speaks of *Voluntas signi*, so far forth as this *Signum* is *Præceptum*; and in that respect I take *Voluntas signi*, to be the same with the *Will of Precept*, as you call it. And so (it seems) did Dr. *Twiss* take

take it; for you see he makes mans duty to be the Object of *Voluntas signi*, even as you do of God's *Will of Precept*. When therefore he saith, That *Volunt. signi* is improperly called *God's Will*: he means only, that *God's Precept* is improperly called his *Will*, it being properly the *sign*, or *signification* of his Will: Not but that God *truly*, and *properly* willeth that which the Precept containeth; Not always that it *shall be done*, but always that it shall be be *mans duty* to do it, as the Doctor expresly speaketh, and (I suppose the Schoolmen meant no otherwise.) But, *Rhetorfortis* doth yet more plainly describe *Vol. signi*, so as you do God's *Preceptive Will*. *Voluntas approbans* (*seu signi*) *non revelat nobis Intentionem seu decretum Dei. Hae enim & similia*, [Cain, Saul, Jude, *obedite & Credite*] *non habent hoc pro re significatâ, aut volitâ à Deo*, [*Mea hac est Intentio, & Decretum est apud me ab aterno, ut obedietis*, &c.] *Sed tantum dicit Deus*; *Hoc precepto* Caino, & Saulo, &c. *propositio, ego indico & revelo, mihi gratam & acceptam esse obedientiam, ad quam ex lege & debito obligati estis Creatori Vestro, siquidem ei accepti esse velitis, sive actu obediatis, sive non.* Rhetort. Exer. 2. c. 1. §. 5. *quando Deus Jussit* Abrahamum *Immolare filium, non tenebatur* Abrahamus *credere Immolationem* Isaaci *esse Decretam & Intentam à Deo, sed sui esse officii ut Immolaret* Isaacum. ibid.

Reply.

1. I never intended when I wrote that, to assert, That *Impletion* was an uncertain sign of God's Will: But the other four signs are uncertain, as to the *Event*. But I see I should have so cautelously expressed my self, that my speech might not have been so liable to misinterpretation. Yet if I mistake not the usual meaning of the Schoolmen, that under the *Will Beneplaciti & signi*, even under each branch, they comprehended *God's Will* about *whatsoever Object*; then *Impletio Voluntatis Beneplaciti, de Eventu non est signum Voluntatis Beneplaciti de Jure*. The killing of Christ was no sign, that it was *God's Pleasure* that it should be the Jews *duty* to kill him. Your yielding the *three first* to be *uncertain signs*, shews that the Schoolmens Distinction

on is not the same with mine: For they are not *uncertain signs* of God's *Immanent Will de Debito*.

2. I perceive no proof of your Assertion, That *Permission* is a certain sign of God's *Will de Eventu*: [If God permit a thing (say you) to be done, it is a certain sign it is his Will to have it done.] I believe not this. Indeed, if a thing *be done on God's Permission*, it is a certain sign he *would* permit it to be done: But not, *if he permit it*, therefore *would be have it done*; that is, the *event* (that *it is done*) whether by *Permission*, or *Efficiency*, is a certain sign that he Willed that Event, or to permit that Event. But the *Permission* is no such sign that he Willed the Event, but only it is a sign that he Willed that *Permission*. For God permitteth that which never cometh to pass. Doth he not permit the wicked to amend? the Drunkard to be sober? *&c.* I think he doth *permit it*, and *more* than permit it. Indeed, where the Creature hath a natural, or adventitious inclination to the Act (as a stone to fall downward, a sinner to do wickedly, *&c.*) and there are the *mediums* at hand which are necessary thereto, there Gods bare Permission is certainly connexed to the following Event; and consequently, is

Pennotus interpreteth the Schoolmen thus: *Voluntas signi est illa secundum quam Deus denominatur Volens non secundum rei veritatem, sed per quandam Metaphoram & Similitudinem, quia Causando aliquos effectus se gerit per modum volentis in quantum aliquid vel præcipit, vel consulit, vel facit: ut docet* D. Thom. in 1. dist. 45. q. 1. a. 4. & 1. q. 19. a. 11. & 12. *Ob quam causam divinum consilium vel præceptum dicuntur etiam Voluntas signi per Metonymiam; quia sunt effectus & signa ejusdem divinæ voluntatis, ad eum modum quo ultimum testamentum, quod quis moriens condit, appellare solemus ultimam illius Voluntatem, &c.* Pennot. Propugn. l. 4. c. 20. p. 224.

is a sign, that (in some sort) he willeth it. But where the Creature needs God's *actual help*, yea, his *special Grace* to perform any act, I think *his bare Permission* is no such sign that he *willeth the Event*. If it be, sure God willeth the Sanctification, or Repentance of Reprobates, when he doth so much *more than permit it*; (except we take up Dr. *Twisse's* poor conceit, that *Actus elicitus volendi videtur propriè dici non posse impediri. Quia tum dici solet aliquis impediri, cum non sinitur facere quod vult.* Vind. Grat. l. 2. part. 2. Digres. 6. p. 360. As if the not-hindering of an *Active Power* to move, according to the *inclination* of its *Habits*, and the *drawing* of its *Object*, were not properly *Permission*.) If you take *permittere*, either *properly* for *non-impedire*, as it respecteth *Acts*; or *improperly*, for *non-alteration*, as it respecteth *Qualities*: In both senses, *Permission* is *no sign* that God willeth the *Event*. I believe you judg, that *Twiss* in his Digression hath justly questioned *Perkin's* saying, *Quicquid non impedit Deus, ideo evenit quia Deus non impedit.*

All this I speak of *Permission-Natural*; for as for *Moral-Permission*, either *per Legem, vel in Moribus*, it is beyond all doubt, that it is *no sign* infallible of God's willing the *Event* of the thing permitted. And for *Austin's* saying (cited so commonly) what is it to your purpose? If it be true, that *Non fit aliquid nisi omnipotens fieri velit, vel sinendo*, &c. (the [*fit*] is the *signum*;) doth it therefore follow, that *Non permittitur aliquid nisi quod Deus fieri velit?* But if *Permission* be a sign of God's Will, what shall we think of that Doctrine, that denieth that there is any such thing as God's *Permission* of any Action that ever was done in the World? I think the

the Doctrine of [*The Necessity of Physical efficient Predetermination to every act of the Creature,*] is guilty of this, as its direct Consequence (if I may so far excuse) which yet some Divines, especially *Twiss*, do lay so great weight on; when it is not from Christ, or *Paul*, but the Dominicans. For how can God be said to permit that act, which he is the principal determining efficient Cause of.

As for your Allegation out of *Aqu. Twiss*, and *Rutherford*, that they mean as I: I answer, 1. Their making *Voluntas signi* but *Metaphorically Voluntas*, shews the contrary. 2. You confess that it is but [so far forth as this *Signum* is *Præceptum:*] But then sure the Distinction, 1. Speaking *de signo ut signo, & de præcepto ut signo*; and 2. Of four more signs, cannot be the same with mine. 3. *Twisse's* is above half the same as mine, for indeed I received it from him: But, 1. He saw further into it than the Schoolmen (or than most of our own) and *Rutherford* follows him. 2. Yet he seems to take no notice of the *Immanent Will de Debito*, whereof the *Precept* is *signum*: Nor yet doth he extend it to the *whole* Law, but only to *Precept*: Nor do I find him speaking, as you friendly interpret him, that [*It is properly the sign, or signification of his Will,* &c.] I make God's Will *de Debito* (which I shall take leave to call, his *Legislative*, or *Ethical Will*) to stand at the top in the *Series* of our *Ethicks*, indeed the Fountain of all Due: And his Will *de Ente*, *vel Eventu*, to stand at the top of our *Philosophy de Ente*. Lastly, I will not contend any more about this, seeing I am glad if you be in the right: For as it confirmeth me, to have you of my Judgment; so will it do more, to have so many such as those named.

Aphor.

Aphor.

Page 9. *These Absolute Promises, are but mere gracious Predictions what God will do for his Elect.*

Animadvers.

I dislike not this; but your self elsewhere seems to dislike it; viz. *Append. p.* 49. For it being objected, [*But all these are rather Prophecies, than Promises.*] You answer, *If that which expresseth the engaging of the Word, or Truth of God, be not a Promise, I would you would tell me what it.*

Reply.

In the last you perswade me, that others agree with me more than I was aware of: And here you agree with me, but I agree not with my self. If I can but so well accord with you, and others all along, I hope to be fairly reconciled to my self, and then we are all agreed.

1. How far this Promise belongeth to *God's Legislative Will*, and how far to his *Will de Eventu*, I fully told you my thoughts, *Append. p.* 43, 44. To which I need not add much more.

2. You know the chief part of my words there, are those which you leave out: I say, [*If that which expresseth the engagement of the Word, and Truth of God, to bestow good upon a man*, &c.] *Mere Prophecies* may *discover God's mind to do good*; and thence we may collect, that they shall certainly be fulfilled, because the Speaker is true. But they are not an *engaging of God's Word and Truth, to bestow good on any man, or Society*: For if they so *engage*, it is to some body, and to them it is a *Promise*.

3. These *Absolute Promises* are *directly Predictions*, and so belong to the Will of *Purpose*, or *de Eventu*: But, as is explained *Append. p.* 44. they are

are also *Promises*, and therefore called by the Apostle, *a Covenant*; and so belong to the *Legislative Will*. There is nothing written in Scripture, but what belongs to *God's Law*, and respecteth Due one way or other: But then some parts are *essentially* and *directly* God's Law, and do directly determine of *Due*. Others do *directly* speak *de Eventu*, and do but indirectly speak *de Debito*; or it may be are but subservient to those parts which do speak *de Debito*, and so belong *Reductivè* to the Law; or are *Adjuncts* of it: And so are all Scripture-*Prophecies* and *Histories*; as in mens Laws, the Preamble and Historical Narratives of the Occasion of the Law, is an *Adjunct*, and in some sense a *part* of the Law.

4. There *are Promises* that *properly* belong not to the *Legislative Will*, nor do speak *de Debito*: The English word *Promise*, comprizeth all those three, or is applicable to them *all*; which *Grotius* mentioneth *de Jure Belli, l. 2. c. 11. p. 210.* 1. *Assertio explicans de futuro animum qui nunc est.* 2. *Pollicitatio, cum Voluntas seipsam pro futuro tempore determinat, cum signo sufficiente ad indicandam perseverandi necessitatem.* Neither of these, as such, belong to Law, or speak *de Debito Constitutivè*. But the *last* doth, which is, 3. *Promissio perfecta: ubi ad determinationem talem accedit signum Volendi Jus proprium alteri conferre, similem habens effectum qualem alienatio dominii. Est enim aut via ad alienationem rei, aut alienatio particulæ cujusdam nostræ libertatis. Illuc pertinent promissa dandi: huc promissa faciendi.*

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Those Promises fall under the Will of Purpose, not of Precept.*

Animadverf.

It seems you take the word [*Precept*] very largely, and improperly. For otherwise it might seem superfluous to add this. For how should a mere absolute Promise fall under the Will of Precept? This were to make a *Precept* of a *Promise*.

Reply.

Did I not tell you, that I chuse to call it the *Legislative Will*, as extending it *ad Debitum præmii & pœnæ* as well as *ad Officium*, rather than by any other term? If I make any use of other mens terms, must I therefore be tied to their sense, contrary to that which I have fully expressed to be my own? But if you think that the Authors of that Distinction, or the uses, do so restrain it to *Precept*, how can you then think that they mean the same that I do?

Aphorism.

Page 15. *That this Life promised in the first Covenant, was only the continuance of that state that* Adam *was then in in Paradise, is the judgment of most Divines.*

Animadverf.

Whether most Divines be of this judgment or not, I will not enquire: By divers passages in your Book you seem to assent unto it, but so cannot I for these Reasons:

1. *Adam* by his Transgression became liable to the second Death: Therefore if he had been obedient, he had enjoyed the happiness of the life to come. For the Reward of Obedience should have (it's likely) held proportion with the punishment of Disobedience.

2. It seems incongruous, that a rational and understanding Creature, being perfectly righteous, and holy, and every way obedient, should always lead an Animal and Natural

life and never attain to greater happineſs than this life affords.

3. *Adam* perſevering in the ſtate of Innocency, ſhould have procreated Children, and his Children other Children, and ſo on. Therefore if *Adam* and his Poſterity ſhould always have lived upon the Earth, how, in an ordinary way of Providence, could the Earth have been able either to ſuſtain, or ſupport all that ever ſhould be born, all from the very firſt ſtill remaining, and more and more continually ſucceeding to all Eternity? If you ſay, that after ſome continuance of time, the Propagation of Mankind ſhould have ceaſed; *viz.* when the Earth was ſo full, that it could well bear no more: Where doth the Scripture warrant this conceit? Rather it intimateth, that many having lived ſome time upon Earth, ſhould have been tranſlated into Heaven.

For, 4. It ſeems that Paradiſe was a Type of Heaven, whither man, if he had kept his firſt eſtate, ſhould have been tranſlated: And that the Tree of Life was a Type of Eternal Life, *Rev.* 2. 7. & 22. 14. And though I like not to be peremptory in things of this nature, yet there may ſeem to be ſome probability in that opinion, which ſome of old have entertained; *viz.* That if man had not faln into Diſobedience, he ſhould have lived a thouſand years upon Earth, and then have been conveyed to Heaven. For though *Adam*, and divers of his Off-ſpring, lived many hundred years, yet neither he, nor any after him, did reach unto a thouſand. See Mr. *Mede*, p. 284. *Edit. Lat.*

Reply.

Here are two Queſtions to be conſidered: 1. Whether *Adam* ſhould have been tranſlated to Heaven by a *Local removal?* This is it that I ſaw no Scripture for, or convincing Reaſon, and therefore durſt not affirm, nor receive as certain. 2. Whether *Adam* ſhould have attained to a far higher degree of Happineſs in that Paradiſe he then was in, by God's fuller manifeſtation of himſelf to him, as to the Saints in Heaven: This I never denied, nor yet affirmed, nor medled with. And indeed, ſince I wrote that Book, I am grown to a greater doubtfulneſs

fulneſs of the whole; and will not now dare to affirm or deny either of the Queſtions. For I do not know ſo much as to make me any thing confident. I confeſs while I looked merely at expreſs Scripture-words, I was loth to affirm what Scripture affirmed not; and therefore inclined to the Negative of the firſt Queſtion. But ſince, upon the conſideration of the drift and reaſon of Scripture-Doctrine, I am much ſtaggered. And indeed, that which ſtaggered me was none of the common Arguments brought againſt M. *Ball*, *Gataker*, *Cameron*, and the reſt that go that way that I then did; but the mere Conſiderations *de fine*, and how far it is Natural, and how far not, as I was ſeriouſly reading *Scotus*, *Rada*, and others, of that weighty, knotty ſubject. I dare not now be ſo bold, as to affirm, That *Adam* was created *in Patriâ*, and not *in Viâ*; that is, in the full fruition of his Happineſs; rather in the way to it, with an imperfect taſte of it. But eſpecially I am very jealous leſt I ſhould give advantage to Infidelity, and the denial of the Glory of the Saints in Heaven, if I ſhould go too far in aſſerting the Supernaturality of it. If *Adam* had not a *Potentia Naturalis* of ſuch a Beatitude, it would raiſe doubts whether *we have*; ſeeing he was as perfect *quoad Humanitatem* as we, and ſo potentially as

It is long ſince this was written, and ſince I have been fully convinced, that *Adam* was made for Heaven, that is, the Saints ſtate or Glory: 1. From the natural tendency of all the ſuperior faculties of the Soul. 2. From many Scripture-texts, which deſcribe *Redemption* in words importing our Reſtauration to a Bleſſedneſs which we loſt, as to the title and hopes of it. Therefore I hope my doubting then, will further no ones doubting.

capable of such a Blessedness: And if he had a *Potentia Naturalis* to it, then it would seem that it was not given him in vain; and that he had not attained the perfection that he was made for, if he had not attained all that he was made *Potentialiter* capable of. Some more such School-Reasons of late have staggered me in this, and made me most incline to think, that *Adam* should have had the same, or near the same degree of Glory as we. But yet I have much to say on the other side: However, I little know where he should have enjoyed it, or how removed to it, if removed. I must needs therefore confess my ignorance here, till God be pleased to remove it. But I confess I had before thought on your Reasons, and they seemed not cogent to me: For, 1. If by the second Death, you mean the same degree of Punishment which is due to the Despisers of Christ, I deny that *Adam* was liable to it: If you mean, the perpetuating of his Souls sufferings, I grant it: But all that will thence follow is, that his felicity should have been perpetuated, if he had not sinned. For it will not follow, that because *Adam* was to go to his perpetual Death, by the temporal Death which he had deserved, that therefore he was to go to Glory by a change, or removal. For the place where *Adam*'s Soul should have suffered, none knows it. And 2. God could encrease *Adam*'s happiness, without any removal by a fuller Manifestation of himself to him. How far the Life hereafter shall be Animal, or Natural, is scarce well known by us now; nor how far God might have removed *Adam*'s state from present imperfections, even in that Paradise. And, 3. It seems vain to put such a Question, How God should

ſhould provide room for Mankind, and ſo to object difficulties to God; eſpecially conſidering, that God knew there would be no place for ſuch difficulties, ſeeing he had decreed to permit Mans fall. And, 4. It follows not, [Paradiſe was a Type of Heaven, therefore *Adam* ſhould have been tranſlated to Heaven.] Laſtly, where, or what that Paradiſe was, little do I know.

Aphoriſm.

Page 15. *THe ſame Damnation that followeth the breach of the New-Covenant, it could not be (viz. which was threatned in the firſt) no more than the life then enjoyed, is the ſame with that which the New-Covenant promiſeth.*

Anim adverſ.

You ſhould ſay, [*No more than the life then promiſed is the ſame*, &c.] For otherwiſe your Compariſon is not equal. Now to me it is more than probable, for the Reaſons prealledged, That the Life promiſed in the firſt Covenant, was the ſame with that which the New-Covenant doth promiſe, and conſequently, that the ſame Death and Damnation (for ſubſtance) is threatned in both Covenants. And do not many yet lie under the firſt Covenant, and that ſhall be puniſhed merely as Tranſgreſſors of that Covenant, the New-Covenant having never ſo much as been made known unto them? See *Rom.* 2. 12. And ſhall not the Damnation of ſuch, be (for ſubſtance) the ſame with the Damnation of thoſe that tranſgreſs the New-Covenant? Shall not both go to the ſame Hell, and endure the ſame Torment, though not in the ſame degree? See 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 7,8,9.

In the *Append.* p. 10. you argue thus, [*If you ſay that* Adam *ſhould have died, and roſe again to Torment, what Scripture ſaith ſo? 2. Where ſhould he have riſen? 3. You contradict many Scriptures, which make Chriſt the Mediator the only Procurer of the Reſurrection.*]

Anſw. 1. The Scripture ſheweth, that man tranſgreſſing the firſt Covenant, ſhould die the firſt Death, *Gen.* 2. 17. and

3. 19. And not the first Death only, but also the second Death, if it be not prevented by that Mercy which is held out in the New-Covenant. *The wages of sin is death*, saith the Apostle, *Rom.* 6. 23. And the Death which he speaketh of, is opposed to etrenal Life, which is the free-gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord; and therefore it must extend to that which the Scripture calls the second Death. And seeing the Body is co-partner with the Soul in the Transgression, it is not probable that the first Covenant doth denounce the second Death only against the Soul, and not against the Body also, on which (after the Soul is separated from it) it cannot be inflicted without a Resurrection.

2. *Adam*, and so others, should have risen either (as now they shall) in the end of the World, or when it should have pleased God to raise them.

3. Though Christ as Mediator be now the only Procurer of the Resurrection, yet it follows not, that if Christ had not been Mediator, there should have been no Resurrection; no more than it doth follow, that then the Sentence of Damnation should not have been executed upon Transgressors. That which you cite in the *Aphor.* p. 30. from 1 *Cor.* 15.12. & 21.22. speaks only of *Resurrection unto Glory*, as is clear by *Vers.* 23. & 42, *&c.*

Reply.

I confess that I then supposed there was no other Life promised, than that which was enjoyed; and that the right to it was from *actual Collation*, and not by *Promise:* My Reason was, because I found no such Promise. And most Divines say, that the words of the *Commination implying* a *Promise*, are our proof that it was *a Covenant or Promise*. Now I found no Promise certainly implied in the words of the Commination, but the continuance of that Life which he had. For to say, [*Thou shalt die,*] implies indeed [*otherwise thou shalt not die:*] But no more.

I have shewed you now what makes me suspend * my judgment: And for your further Reason, [*That many lie under the first Covenant, that shall be punished merely as Transgressors of that Covenant, the New-Covenant having never been made known to them.* I reply far more confidently, that I am strongly perswaded you will never prove it while you live. I do not think that any man living, is now under the *mere Covenant of Works, as* Adam *was, Sine Fœdere novo, vel Gratiâ remediante.* Prove that God dealeth with any one on these terms now only, [*Obey perfectly, and live*;] or, [*If thou ever sin, thou shalt die everlastingly.*] I do affirm indeed, That men may be said to be under the Law of *Nature still*; but not *merely*, nor *alone*, as *Adam*, without *any Remedy*. I could well find in my heart to joyn issue on this point, and stay longer on it, but that it would be a Digression, being on so light a touch. Only thus much,

* And since resolved me.

1. The Covenant of Works doth not allow men (or God, according to that Covenant, doth not give men) such rich and numerous Mercies, as the poorest Indians do enjoy; therefore God dealeth not with them merely on the terms of the Covenant of Works.

2. The Mercies given, according to the mere Covenant of Works, are not given to *lead men to Repentance*; (for it alloweth *no Repentance*, but that of *Desperation*:) But the Mercies that Pagans have, are given to lead them to Repentance; therefore they are not given according to the mere Law of Works.

3. If Christ, as *Mediator*, shall *judg all*, then *all*

are ſome-way of that Kingdom whereof he is King, and under thoſe Laws by which he ruleth: But, &c. therefore, &c. And therefore not under the mere Law of Works. The common Anſwer, [*That he will judg the Devils,*] is beſide the buſineſs. He judgeth them as *Captives*, Enemies; but he judgeth all wicked men as *Rebellious Subjects*. It will not follow [He judgeth Foreign open Enemies as a Conqueror, and not as their King; therefore ſo he doth by Domeſtick Rebels:] All wicked men are Chriſt's *Subjects de Jure*, though not by *Conſent de Facto*. They may have his *Mercies* alſo, though they know not *him*: As many are *God's Subjects*, and have *his Mercies* (as will be confeſſed) who yet *know not God*.

4. If all ſhall be judged at laſt, according to the well or ill-uſing of the Talents of Mercy, then not merely according the Law of Works: But the Antecedent is plain, *Mat.*25. *& Paſſim*; therefore, *&c.* No Scripture that I know of, doth once intimate, that God will ſay at laſt to any men, [*Go ye Curſed, becauſe ye once ſinned*;] or merely, [*becauſe ye ſinned,*] but becauſe ye *ſinned againſt Mercy that tended to Recovery*. But much more might eaſily be ſaid to this.

Rom. 2. 12. which you cite, hath not the leaſt colour for your Aſſertion, that I can ſee. The Law was of narrower extent, as to its Promulgation and Obligation, than the Grace of the Mediator is: Where doth God ſay, *As many as have ſinned without Mercy or Grace* (that is, *Mercy* contra Meritum) *ſhall periſh without Mercy, or Grace?* That is it that you ſhould prove. And as little is, 1. *Theſſ.* 1. 7,8. to your purpoſe; which plainly ſpeaketh of ſuch as *obey*

not

not the Gospel, and *persecuted the Apostles*: Or if it had not; yet it speaks of none that partaked not of the Mercies of the Mediator.

To that you say against the passage in my *Append.* p. 10. I reply, *Adam* should have suffered *perpetual Misery* (call it first or second Death, as you please:) But your Conjecture at a Probability from the Bodies co-partnership, is no proof. Is it not as probable, that the Body being the Souls Instrument, and acted by it, that everlasting Dissolution should have been its punishment, its nature being also more subject to Dissolution than the Souls; and that Dissolution being a real and grievous punishment? Doubtless it would have been a *Privation of its Perfection*, and that for sin, and therefore a punishment; and the Soul that was chief in sin, to have suffered perpetually, according to its more durable nature. Philosophers commonly say, It is only the Soul that *feels*, and so *suffers now*, and not the *Body it self*. And if so, then the Body would not suffer pain hereafter, but only the *Soul* in that Body. But I am glad you seem not to be of *Twisse*'s opinion, that *Melius est Miserum esse, quam non esse*; or else you would not think it no punishment to the Body, to be for ever dissolved, while the Soul is tormented. But here I assert nothing, but only oppose Conjecture to Conjecture, waiting for your better proof, seeing you affirm. And,

2. Your second is a bare Affirmation, without one Scripture-proof, That *Adam* should have risen again. And,

3. But it follows, that seeing Scripture mentioneth no Resurrection but what is procured by Christ,

Christ, that therefore it is to us uncertain, whether there should have been any. And if all should have risen, whether Christ had died and risen or not; then how will it appear, that any mans Resurrection was purchased by Christ? For whereas you distinguish of Resurrection to Life and to Death, that is not *de Re*, but *de Consequente*. Indeed the *Life* following that Resurrection is then from Christ; But what need he procure a *Resurrection* for them which should rise *without his procurement?* And for the Text, 1 *Cor.* 15. 21, 22. I confess, the end of *Paul* was to confirm and comfort Believers; and therefore *vers.* 23. he applies it to them only: But it follows not therefore, that he speaks only of the Cause of *their* Resurrection. He seems to extend it to all that die in *Adam*; and many other Texts which I'le not now stand on, seem to say as much.

Aphorism.

Page 24. YEt I *doubt not*, Weems *his Interpretation is the plain truth that the words*, [From the foundation of the World] *have reference to the* [Writing of their names in the Book of Life] *and not to the slaying of the Lamb*, &c.

Animadvers.

So also Mr. *Mede* doth expound it: And the Explication is probable from *Rev.* 17. 8. But so also is the other Exposition from 1 *Pet.* 1. 19,20.

Reply.

There is great difference between [*Fore-ordaining*] before the foundation of the World, and [*Slaying*] before it. However, as long as we are agreed of the matter of Doctrine in it, the matter is but small.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 49. *IF we did perfectly obey the Law in Christ (or Christ for us) according to that strict* * Imputation, *then there is no use for suffering for disobedience.*

* What I mean by the Distinction of Imputation in *strict* and *large* sense, I must desire the Reader to see in Mr. *Bradshaw* of Justification, especially in the Epistle to the English Edition: For I hold the Imputation of Christ's Active Righteousness, as he doth, in the larger sense. See also my *Life of Faith*, and, *Appeals to the Light*, and, *Dispute of Imputed Righteousness*, since this written; besides my *Dispute of Justification*.

Animadvers.

Though I could never see any necessity of having Christ's *Active Righteousness imputed* to us, yet this Argument seems not forcible enough against it. For though we should perfectly obey the Law in Christ, that (I speak of obeying actively) seems not sufficient to satisfie for our disobedience in *Adam*, but that in that respect suffering should be requisite.

Reply.

Hitherto your difference with me is small, in comparison of our agreements. And seeing you yield, that according to that Doctrine [*of the strict Imputation of Christ's Active Righteousness*] there is no need of his Satisfaction for any sin, but only Original. I need not trouble my self and you in driving the Argument higher, there being enow more, and this Consequence sufficing to destroy the said Doctrine of strict Imputation. And withal, you must remember, that on your own Supposition (which is, that Christ obeyed not *nostro loco*, as we were in *Adam* before the fall, or in the fall; which is true) it followeth, That therefore Christ's Active Imputed Righteousness (were there such a thing in the

Christ, that therefore it is to us uncertain, whether there should have been any. And if all should have risen, whether Christ had died and risen or not; then how will it appear, that any mans Resurrection was purchased by Christ? For whereas you distinguish of Resurrection to Life and to Death, that is not *de Re*, but *de Consequente*. Indeed the *Life* following that Resurrection is then from Christ; But what need he procure a *Resurrection* for them which should rise *without his procurement?* And for the Text, 1 *Cor.* 15. 21, 22. I confess, the end of *Paul* was to confirm and comfort Believers; and therefore *vers.* 23. he applies it to them only: But it follows not therefore, that he speaks only of the Cause of *their* Resurrection. He seems to extend it to all that die in *Adam*; and many other Texts which I'le not now stand on, seem to say as much.

Aphorism.

Page 24. YEt I *doubt not*, Weems *his Interpretation is the plain truth that the words*, [From the foundation of the World] *have reference to the* [Writing of their names in the Book of Life] *and not to the slaying of the Lamb*, &c.

Animadvers.

So also Mr. *Mede* doth expound it: And the Explication is probable from *Rev.* 17. 8. But so also is the other Exposition from 1 *Pet.* 1. 19,20.

Reply.

There is great difference between [*Fore-ordaining*] before the foundation of the World, and [*Slaying*] before it. However, as long as we are agreed of the matter of Doctrine in it, the matter is but small.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 49. *IF we did perfectly obey the Law in Christ (or Christ for us) according to that strict* * Imputation, *then there is no use for suffering for disobedience.*

* What I mean by the Distinction of Imputation in *strict* and *large* sense, I must desire the Reader to see in Mr. *Bradshaw* of Justification, especially in the Epistle to the English Edition: For I hold the Imputation of Christ's Active Righteousness, as he doth, in the larger sense. See also my *Life of Faith*, and, *Appeals to the Light*, and, *Dispute of Imputed Righteousness*, since this written; besides my *Dispute of Justification*.

Animadvers.

Though I could never see any necessity of having Christ's *Active Righteousness imputed* to us, yet this Argument seems not forcible enough against it. For though we should perfectly obey the Law in Christ, that (I speak of obeying actively) seems not sufficient to satisfie for our disobedience in *Adam*, but that in that respect suffering should be requisite.

Reply.

Hitherto your difference with me is small, in comparison of our agreements. And seeing you yield, that according to that Doctrine [*of the strict Imputation of Christ's Active Righteousness*] there is no need of his Satisfaction for any sin, but only Original. I need not trouble my self and you in driving the Argument higher, there being enow more, and this Consequence sufficing to destroy the said Doctrine of strict Imputation. And withal, you must remember, that on your own Supposition (which is, that Christ obeyed not *nostro loco*, as we were in *Adam* before the fall, or in the fall; which is true) it followeth, That therefore Christ's Active Imputed Righteousness (were there such a thing in the

the sense opposed) would be no sufficient perfect Righteousness to us: For it would not cover our *unrighteousneß Original*, but only *Actual*. But I doubt you will make men angry with you, as they are with me, for your denying *this Imputation of Active Righteousness*: And yet I deny it *less than you*. For I judg that even Christ's *Active Righteousness* is for us, and so imputed to us *quatenus Satisfactoria & quatenus Meritoria*; as Mr. *Bradshaw* hath well opened it.

2. Yet I think that Christ's Satisfaction is here by them made needless. For did not *Adam* himself obey perfectly in Christ, according to that Doctrine. And then what need had *Adam* of Christ's Satisfaction. And do they not say, that Christ's Obedience is imputed to us, as it is a perfect Obedience *pro omni tempore?* and if so, then it must be a cover to our first disobedience in *Adam*, as well as to all that follows.

Aphor.

Page 55. *THough the Sufferings of Christ have the chief place therein, yet his Obedience, as such, may also be Meritorious and Satisfactory.*

Animadvers.

You mean his Active Obedience: For there is also Passive Obedience, as well as Active.

Reply.

I do mean all *Obedience*, as *Obedience*: For I suppose you mean *Christ's Sufferings as Penal* (when you call them the *Satisfaction*, and exclude the *Active Righteousness*) and not directly as *Obedience*: Though, no doubt, they must not be separated from the consideration of their being *Voluntary* and *Obedi-*

Obediential. But to tell you my thoughts, I think the phraſe of [*Paſſive Obedience*] is very dark, if you underſtand it in the ſame near ſenſe as you do [*Active Obedience*:] For all Obedience is ſo called formally, in reference to ſome Law or Command of a Superior to which we obey. Now *Pœna*, or Suffering, is not the direct and proper matter of any Precept, as a Precept: The Law doth threaten Puniſhment, and not command it. Yet as Suffering is the remote matter, ſo it may be called, *Paſſive Obedience*; (that is, God commandeth us to ſubmit to Sufferings.) Submiſſion and Patience is the direct matter of Obedience; and Suffering the *Remote*: And therefore I will not quarrel with the phraſe of [*Paſſive Obedience.*]

Aphoriſm.

Page 56. *AND ſo* Rom. 5. 19. *By the Obedience of one, many are made righteous.*

Animadverſ.

That place will evince nothing for you, becauſe it may, and probably ſhould be interpreted of Obedience by Suffering. *He humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto death,* &c. Phil. 2, 8.

Reply.

1. But it ſeems to ſpeak of *Obedience*, as *Obedience*: And then it is not much matter, whether the *matter* of it be *doing*, or *ſuffering*. For in Chriſt's *ſuffering*, if it were not only his *ſuffering*, as ſuffering or *Penalty*, but alſo as *Obedience*, which was *Satisfactory*: Then why may not his *Active Obedience*, as *Obedience*, alſo be *Satisfactory*? For *à quatenus ad omne valet conſequentia.* However, there is the ſame *formal Nature* of *Obedience* in *Active Obedience*, as is in *Paſſive*. Nay, even *Paſſive Obedience* is

is more properly and *nearly Active*; and but *improperly* and *remotely Passive*. For the Act of *Willing Submission*, is that which is commanded, and is the *materia proxima & propria* of Obedience: The *Penalty* (as I said even now) is not commanded directly and properly, but threatned: And the pain, as pain, is but remotely the matter of Obedience, as the Object of our Patience.

2. And *Rom.* 5.19. seemeth to include *Active Obedience*, as well as *Passive*: For it seems to intimate *such Obedience* as is opposed to *Adam's Disobedience*. However, it is such as is opposed to Disobedience in general, and therefore it is (as I said) Obedience *qua talis*, and not as Suffering.

Aphorism.

Page 58. *Some Works he performed, which were our duty indeed; but he was not bound to perform them in regard of himself: Such were all the Observances of the Ceremonial Law*, &c.

Animadverf.

Christ taking upon him the form of a Servant, and being made under the Law, I see not but he was bound in all things to obey the Will of God, and to observe his Law.

Reply.

* *Paraus* I suppose was as much as most against the Active Righteousness, as such, being the matter of our Righteousness; and yet he concludeth, that *Quicquid denique fecit & passus est ad quod ipse, tanquam Dei filius, non fuit obligatus, est Satisfactio ejus, quam pro nobis praestitit, & justitia quae nobis credentibus à Deo gratis imputatur. Ea enim Satisfactio aequi pollet vel impletioni Legis per obedientiam, vel paenae aeternae propter peccata; ad quorum alterutram non lege obligamur.* Ursin. Cat. q. 60. art. 4. p. 352. I take it as *Paraus* his judgment, as well as *Ursine's*.

* No doubt of that: But, 1. The doubt is, Whether it were the Will of God, that

any

any but ſinners ſhould be obliged by his Law to uſe thoſe Ceremonies, which in their nature imply the Uſers to be ſinners, and intimate a confeſſion of ſin, in ordinary performers; and in their end do tend to recovery from ſin? And indeed, Chriſt did not perform theſe to the ſame ends as ſinners did, and as they were mainly intended for ſuch in their Inſtitution.

2. I ſaid he was not bound to perform them [*in regard of himſelf*:] that is, [*finaliter*, he was no ſinner, and had no ſin to pardon of his own, nor any ſinful wants to be ſupplied; and ſo had not thoſe ends of his own to move or neceſſitate him to uſe them, as others had:] But he uſed them, both to ſhew his ſubjection, and take up that burthen of tedious Ceremonious-Worſhip, which juſtly lay on us; and alſo to give us an example, *&c.*

3. It hence therefore follows, that ſeeing he uſed the actions (as Circumciſion, Offerings, *&c.*) ſeparated from their Legal ends, to other ends of his own, that his primary obligation to them was *ex vi ſponſionis propriæ* (as was all his obligation to ſuffer) and not *ex Lege*: (For elſe the Law would have obliged him to the Act and End together.) And then the Law did after oblige him upon his ſubjecting, and ſubmitting himſelf voluntarily thereto; and that but limitedly and in part, ſo far as he ſubmitted to it; that is, to the *ſame Action*, but not for the *ſame Ends*: Becauſe it could not oblige him beyond that his undertaking, and voluntary ſubmiſſion. So that I conceive, if Chriſt had ſtood before God, only in the perſon of God-man in Righteouſneſs, he ſhould have been obliged only to obey thoſe Laws which belong to the Righteous, and have nothing either

either in the end of them, or burdensomness of them, which proceedeth from sin: But seeing Christ undertook to be in that low condition, and bear all that burden of *pœnal Actions*, and *direct Sufferings* which sinners had subjected themselves to by sin; therefore he would be *made under the Law*, and so undertake those Legal performances. And therefore it is in *respect of us*, as the *Undertaker of our burden*, that he used them; who otherwise, in respect *of himself* (though supposing him man) being perfectly righteous, should not have been obliged to those duties that were ordained for sinners, as sinners. This is my meaning: But for the thing, it being of no greater moment, I leave it to your better judgment, and will not contend.

Aphorism.

Page 59. *YEt when he voluntarily put himself in the state of a servant, and under the Law, not for his own sake, but for ours, his Work is nevertheless Meritorious.*

Animadvers.

Christ putting himself in the state of a servant, and under the Law, though voluntarily, yet now his Obedience is necessary: For it is necessary that the Creature should be obedient to the Creator.

2. Hence it follows, That not Christ's Active Righteousness, *as such* (as you affirm, *page* 54, & 55.) but in respect of his Condescension to that *low estate*, is part of his *Satisfaction.*

Reply.

This is the main thing that (in this point of Satisfaction) I differ from you in. I think (and that somewhat confidently) that his after-subjection, and the after-necessity of his Obedience, do not

at

all evacuate or diminiſh the Meritoriouſneſs of his Actions: Becauſe that Neceſſity is an aſſumed, and not an *aliunde*-impoſed neceſſity. And God is not unjuſt, to forget the ſtate that the Subject was in while he was free; nor to ſeparate in his Conſideration and Valuation the after-action, from the former free-Engagement, and the Dignity and Freedom of the Perſon then engaging. If I being a Free-man, do bind my ſelf to be your Servant, or your ſlave (I mean to be abſolutely at your command *quoad actiones ſerviles*) on Condition that you give me for my ſervice 20 *l. per annum*: Doth my ſervice deſerve none of this wages after, becauſe I being once bound, my ſervice is neceſſary? And remember, that thus Chriſt became bound by *quaſi-Contract*, and ſo *Conditionally*; and the Condition was, That his ſervice ſhould be accepted as Meritorious and Satisfactory, towards the Recovery of ſinners. To ſay therefore, That his Service, or Actions ceaſed to be *Meritorious*; is either to ſay, They loſt their Dignity (which may not be imagined;) or God ceaſed or failed to accept them as Meritorious and Satisfactory, and ſo broke his Covenant (as we may call it) which is as little to be imagined. *Jacob*'s ſervice (as ſervice, and not only as ſuffering) deſerved *Leah* and *Rachel*, &c. nevertheleſs becauſe he became bound to ſerve. Nay more, among juſt men, it is not only the wages agreed on by Covenants, that is deſerved by a painful ſervant; but if he do much more, and ſo benefit his Maſter more, he doth truly deſerve more, and the juſt Maſter will pay him more; though not by virtue of the Obligation of the Covenant, yet by virtue of the Obligation of the Law of Nature,

which is before it: So great is the difference between the service of one that doth voluntarily oblige himself, when he was *sui juris*; and one that is originally under your absolute Dominion: The one may sell you his service before hand, according to its value, which supposeth the future reality of that value and merit; but the other cannot, because he, and all that is his, is properly not his own, but yours.

Add to this what I before told you, that the Godhead was never subjected (either as to *Propriety, ad Dominum*; or to *Obedience, ad Rectorem*) in it self, but only it may by *Communication* be *called subject*: And therefore the Actions of Christ, receiving their *chief Dignity* from his *chief Nature*, which was never *in it self subject*, must needs be highly *Meritorious*; both, 1. Because of the Dignity. 2. And of the Freedom of that Nature.

2. And therefore I utterly deny your Consequence on these grounds, and affirm still, That Christ's *Active Righteousness, or Obedience, as such, is Meritorious and Satisfactory*. And indeed, the Question should rather be, *Whether it be only* Pœna Christi, *or* Obedientia *also, that satisfieth and meriteth:* (as I before hinted.)

Aphorism.

Page 60. *EVen some Works that are Due, may yet be so excellent, that they may give Satisfaction for former injuries*, &c.

Animadvers.

I see not how Works which are otherwise due, can properly be Meritorious or Satisfactory. This seems repugnant to that of our Saviour, Luke 17. 10. *When you have done all things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done but what our duty was to do.*

Reply.

Reply.

1. We muſt diſtinguiſh of the *Obligation* or *Cauſe* of the dueneſs. 2. And of the *Relation* in which we conſider the parties.

See Biſhop *Uſher*'s Catechiſm, affirming the Obedience of Chriſt to be part of his Satisfaction to the firſt Covenant.

1. If the *Obligation* be merely impoſed, *per abſolutum Dominum*, then you may carry it your way: But where the *Obligation* is *Self-impoſed* or *aſſumed*, or cauſed by *Conditional Contract*, and the Condition of this Contract doth expreſs or imply the Acceptation of the Work, as Meritorious or Satisfactory; there (as is ſaid) the caſe is plain againſt you.

2. But ſuppoſe it were not ſo: Yet, 1. Though it be granted, that I cannot merit of an *equal*, by doing *my duty*; 2. Nor yet of an *Abſolute Lord*, as ſuch: 3. Yet of a *Rector qua talis*, I may. Not that the Reward is due to me *in ſenſu abſoluto & ſimpliciter*. But 1. *Comparatè & ſecundum quid* it is. For a *Rector* is obliged to make a difference between the moſt *perfectly obedient* Subjects, and that do eminent ſervice for the Commonwealth; and the *diſobedient*, or leſs profitable, and that by rewarding and encouraging the obedient and uſeful. 2. And this is due principally to the *Common Good*, and to the *end of Government*: And ſo the Obligation ſeems to be *a fine ad Media*, and prudential. I have told you in the Aphoriſm, that I will not differ with you, if you call this (Merit of Governing, and not Commutative Juſtice) but *Merit improprie & ſecundum quid*.

Yet, though this be leſs properly [*Merit*] where it

it is mixt with sinful demerits that may cloud it, it is *more properly Merit*, where the Obedience and Serviceableness to the Common-Good is absolutely perfect; as in Christ it was.

Aphorism.

Page 61. *THE Interest of the Divine Nature in all the Works of Christ, maketh them to be infinitely Meritorious, and so satisfactory.*

Animadvers.

Viz. Because it is an Infinite Condescension of the Person so partaking of the Divine Nature to do such Works; *viz.* Of Active Obedience (for of such I suppose you mean) so that still, not properly Christ's Active Obedience, simply considered, but his Condescension is Meritorious, and so Satisfactory.

Reply.

1. If the Interest of the Divine Nature do put a value on the *Penalty* as such, or on the *Condescension* as such, then also on the *Obedience*, or *Good Actions* as such; (for there is *eadem ratio*:) But the former you grant, therefore, &c.

2. If Christ's *Condescension* become *Meritorious* by the Interest of the Godhead, then his *Active Obedience* doth so: (If you mean that *Condescension*, not only as at his *first Undertaking*, but as manifested and exercised in the performance:) For his Condescension (so taken) is his *Active Obedience*: *Condescendere ad pœnam ferendam*, is *Consentire ad pœnam aliter indebitam ferendam*, and so not to murmur or resist. And this is somewhat antecedent to the Suffering it self. (Both *Agere & Actionem suspendere*, belong to that which we call Active Obedience, as distinct from Passive; and therefore which-soever you instance in, it comes all to one.)

3. What

3. What if I ſhould prove to you, that *no ſuffering*, either *as ſuffering*, or as *puniſhment* can *merit?* It may *ſatisfie*, but whether it can *merit*, conſider theſe things. If it *merit*, it muſt be either for the *innate excellency* of the *thing*, or for the *ends obtained*, or benefits received by it, by him from whom it ſo meriteth. In the former ſence, it can merit but an acknowledgment, and eſtimation, and praiſe. And thus *pœna qua pœna non meretur*: 1. Becauſe as it is *in patiente*, it is *malum & non bonum*. 2. It is *involuntarium quid*; and therefore *non meritorium*.

Object. *It was voluntary to Chriſt.*

Anſw. Only *indirectè*, *ſecundum quid*, *ad finem ulteriorem*: But *pœna qua pœna*, he naturally continued to *Nill*: His Nature was againſt it; and his Will naturally, as it was *malum ſibi*: And therefore he prayed, that *the Cup might paſs &c.* yet *ſubmitted* to it, at his Fathers will and his own. So that it was properly a *willing* of the *end*, but the *penalty* was more properly *ſubmitted to* than *willed*; yet not as *pœna*, *vel malum*, but as *medium ad finem optimum*. And then, that Good that Puniſhment hath, is as it is *à puniente*, *& in effectu*; and ſo it is the *Puniſher* that *meriteth* for his *Juſtice*; and not the *puniſhed* for *Suffering*.

Further, it hath no virtuous Moral Goodneſs in it, as it is in the Sufferer: For all ſuch Goodneſs is the *materia Præcepti*, *& non Comminationis*. The Preceptive part of the Law only doth conſtitute the *debitum officii*, and ſo the *moral Goodneſs*: But *pœna qua pœna non præcipitur*.

2. And if you ſay, That it is for its *Ends* or *Conſequences*, that *pœna meretur*.

it is mixt with sinful demerits that may cloud it, it is *more properly Merit*, where the Obedience and Serviceableness to the Common-Good is absolutely perfect; as in Christ it was.

Aphorism.

Page 61. *THE Interest of the Divine Nature in all the Works of Christ, maketh them to be infinitely Meritorious, and so satisfactory.*

Animadvers.

Viz. Because it is an Infinite Condescension of the Person so partaking of the Divine Nature to do such Works; *viz.* Of Active Obedience (for of such I suppose you mean) so that still, not properly Christ's Active Obedience, simply considered, but his Condescension is Meritorious, and so Satisfactory.

Reply.

1. If the Interest of the Divine Nature do put a value on the *Penalty* as such, or on the *Condescension* as such, then also on the *Obedience*, or *Good Actions* as such; (for there is *eadem ratio*:) But the former you grant; therefore, *&c.*

2. If Christ's *Condescension* become *Meritorious* by the Interest of the Godhead, then his *Active Obedience* doth so: (If you mean that *Condescension*, not only as at his *first Undertaking*, but as manifested and exercised in the performance:) For his Condescension (so taken) is his *Active Obedience*: *Condescendere ad pœnam ferendam*, is *Consentire ad pœnam aliter indebitam ferendam*, and so not to murmur or resist. And this is somewhat antecedent to the Suffering it self. (Both *Agere & Actionem suspendere*, belong to that which we call Active Obedience, as distinct from Passive; and therefore which-sover you instance in, it comes all to one.)

3. What

3. What if I ſhould prove to you, that *no ſuffering*, either *as ſuffering*, or as *puniſhment* can *merit?* It may *ſatisfie*, but whether it can *merit*, conſider theſe things. If it *merit*, it muſt be either for the *innate excellency* of the *thing*, or for the *ends obtained*, or benefits received by it, by him from whom it ſo meriteth. In the former ſence, it can merit but an acknowledgment, and eſtimation, and praiſe. And thus *pœna qua pœna non meretur*: 1. Becauſe as it is *in patiente*, it is *malum & non bonum*. 2. It is *involuntarium quid*; and therefore *not meritorious*.

Object. *It was voluntary to Chriſt.*

Anſw. Only *indirectè*, *ſecundum quid*, *ad finem ulteriorem*: But *pœna qua pœna*, he naturally continued to *Nill*: His Nature was againſt it; and his Will naturally, as it was *malum ſibi*: And therefore he prayed, that *the Cup might paſs &c.* yet *ſubmitted* to it, at his Fathers will and his own. So that it was properly a *willing* of the *end*, but the *penalty* was more properly *ſubmitted to* than *willed*; yet not as *pœna*, *vel malum*, but as *medium ad finem optimum*. And then, that Good that Puniſhment hath, is as it is *à puniente*, *& in effectu*; and ſo it is the *Puniſher* that *meriteth* for his *Juſtice*; and not the *puniſhed* for *Suffering*.

Further, it hath no virtuous Moral Goodneſs in it, as it is in the Sufferer: For all ſuch Goodneſs is the *materia Præcepti*, *& non Comminationis*. The Preceptive part of the Law only doth conſtitute the *debitum officii*, and ſo the *moral Goodneſs*: But *pœna qua pœna non præcipitur*.

2. And if you ſay, That it is for its *Ends* or *Conſequences*, that *pœna meretur*.

I answer, 1. So the *Punisher*, or the *punished* meriteth. The question is only of the *punished*. And whatever good followeth: 1. If the punishment be deserved by himself. 2. Or involuntary, no thanks is due to him, he merits nothing. And therefore *pœna culpæ propriæ* cannot be meritorious. And therefore it was *in Christ* primarily and directly, his *Obediential and Voluntary submitting* to such a penalty, which being not for his own faults, did yet tend to such excellent ends, which made it meritorious. Take all plainly in this one word as the sum, Christ's *sufferings*, as *sufferings*, were not the *immediate matter* of his *merit*; but his *Willingness* the *immediate*, and the *suffering-willed* was the *remote*. His *sufferings* were *first in order Satisfactory*, and after that *remotely Meritorious*; and therefore *Meritorious*, because first Satisfactory: But his *Active Obedience* (or to speak more properly, his *obedience*, as *obedience*, or good-works) was first *Meritorious* (in order of Nature) and then *Satisfactory*; and therefore *Satisfactory*, because *first Meritorious*. Only further consider, Christ's Works have a double merit: One of *God's Acceptance*, and that he be well pleased with them, and ready to reward them in general: This goeth before their *Satisfactoriness*, and is it that I mean: The other is their merit of a *particular benefit* of *Pardon*, *Justification*, &c. for us sinners: This followeth after their *Satisfactoriness*. But in Christ's suffering, there is no *innate merit* (because no goodness) *as suffering*; but only as a *Satisfactory suffering*, conducing to those excellent ends which *quatenus satisfactio* it attaineth: So that punishment, as punishment, or suffering, merits not at all; but all Merit lieth in two things:

Mate-

Materialiter, 1. *In rei dignitate, vel utilitate, ad alium.* 2. *In voluntate agentis:* It is therefore Christ's obedience, and his suffering as voluntary, and conducible to those high and noble ends, and also as the matter (as it were, of the Contract between the Father and Son) which is the Meritorious matter.

Aphorism.

Page 65. AND *so God having parted with that advantage which his Justice had against the sinning World, and having relaxed the Law whereby he might have judged; is therefore said to judg no man, but to give all judgment to the Son,* John 5. 22, 27.

Animadverf.

God hath not so committed all judgment to Christ, but that he also will judg, though by Christ, *Rom.* 2. 5, 6. *Acts* 17. 30, 31. that therefore in *John* 5. 22. is to be understood, that he judgeth no man immediately by himself, but hath committed all judgment to the Son; *i. e.* that the immediate execution of judgment should be from him: Or as *Austin* expounds it, *Secundum hoc dictum est (sc. omne judicium dedit filio) quòd in judicio non in forma Dei, sed in forma hominis apparebit.* This is intimated, *verf.* 27. and hath given him Authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man; *viz.* Because so he is meet to execute judgment in an outward and visible manner, so that every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, *Revel.* 1. 7.

Reply.

1. The Text contains *some kind* of exclusion of God the Father, [*The Father judgeth no man*:] An *utter exclusion* it cannot be, nor an exclusion of the Person or Essence; therefore it must be an exclusion of him in a *certain respect.* Now your Interpretation containeth *no exclusion*: For to say, [*he judgeth not immediately,*] is to include the *Mediant*, but not

to exclude God: As to say, [*he judgeth not alone,*] is to *include* an *Associate*, but not to *exclude himself.*

2. And were it otherwise, how will that agree with our common Doctrine, that [though God may *uti medio*, yet he doth in, and by, and with them, *agere immediatè in omni actione, & immediatione Virtutis & Suppositi?*

3. But yet I never contradicted your Interpretation of the Text, as part of the Truth, but it plainly seems to me to be but part; and the Reason you alledge seems to be defective. For no doubt, God could have judged the World by convenient, sensible Manifestation of his Presence, Power, Justice, &c. as he did in sentencing *Adam* when he had sinned.

But I think the Text means plainly, that God as mere Legislator of the Law of Works, judgeth no man, but hath given all judgment to the Son, as Redeemer and Legislator of, or Judg according to a Law of Grace, or on terms of Grace. It is not now *Deus-Creator secundum fœdus operum solum, sine Remedio: Sed Deus-Redemptor.* I think I could give you good proofs of this Interpretation.

1. The following words (which I think you misinterpret) seem to me to confirm it [*Because he is the Son of Man*;] that is, Because he is the *Incarnate Redeemer or Mediator*, and so because it belongs to his *Office*; and not merely, because he hath *flesh* or *Humane Nature.*

2. If his Dominion over the dead and living, were the end of his Dying, Rising and Reviving, and so was thereby procured, then so was his power of judging (and consequently belongeth to his

his Office, or to Christ as *Mediator*, and not *merely* as being Man: But the former is certain, *Rom.* 14. 9. therefore so is the latter.

3. If as Redeemer or Mediator, he be the rightful *King of all men*, then he shall be the *Judg of all men*, as Mediator or Redeemer; (For it belongeth to his *Kingly* Office to judge, and appoint Judges:) But the former is certain, as I could shew by multitudes of Scriptures. Though *quoad consensum & voluntariam subjectionem*, only the *Church* be Christ's Kingdom; yet *de Jure*, he is King of all the World, and he doth over-rule them, and partly rule them (for the very Law of Nature now is his Law) and that *ut Deus Redemptor & misericors*: They are not ruled merely *per Deum Creatorem*, unappeased and implacable for the breach of the first Law. They that deny this, will have a hard task to justifie all the Wicked or Pagan World at last, as not-guilty of sinning *contra Deum Redemptorem, vel misericordem*: (For he sheweth *not Mercy* according to the tenor of the first Law.)

4. If he condemn men at last for not taking him as their *King to Reign over them*; or for not improving the Talents of his Mercy, then he judgeth them *ex Officio*, as their rightful King: But the former is clear, *Luke* 19. 27. *Matth.* 25, &c. If any think those Texts reach but to those that have heard the Gospel; I think it reacheth as far as this, and to all that have received Talents of Mercy: But that is a subject that I may not now digress to take in.

5. The Scripture fully expresseth it, to be an act of *Christ's power received by him as the Mediator*, and so belonging to his *Office*; therefore only given him as *Incarnate*, or as accommodated with a Humane

mane Nature, *Matth.* 28. *All power in Heaven and Earth, is given to me*; therefore the power of *judging* the World: And this is given to him as *Mediator*, and on his Purchaſe, as the Text plainly intimateth, and *Rom.*14.9. fully expreſſeth. *Rev.* 1.18. *He hath the keys of Death and Hell.* There is comprehended the power of judging: And to have theſe keys, is undeniably belonging to his Office. But I paſs over much more.

And *Calvin* ſaith, that *Judicium pro Imperio ac Poteſtate accipit Evangeliſta*, John 5.22. *Secundum phraſin linguæ Hæbraicæ & nunc firmum tenemus, quod traditum ſit Chriſto Regnum à Patre, ut Arbitrio ſuo cœlum ac terram moderetur. Nam omnia tradita ſunt illi à Patre* (ſaith *Marlorate*) Matth. 11.27. *& data eſt ei omnis poteſtas*, Matth. 28.18. And therefore if this be *Chriſt's Kingdom*, it muſt needs be his *Mediatory Office*.

And indeed the whole context, *Verſ.* 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, &c. ſhew that it is a great part of Chriſt's Mediatory Office that is here expreſſed. And on *Verſ.* 27. ſaith *Calvin*, *Iterum repetit datum ſibi fuiſſe Imperium à Patre, ut plenam & in cælo & in terrâ rerum omnium poteſtatem habeat*, ἐξουσίαν *hic dignitatem ſignificat*: *Judicium verò pro Regimine & Imperio accipitur. Ac ſi diceret, conſtitutum eſſe filium Regem à Patre, qui Mundum gubernet atq; exerceat Patris ipſius poteſtatem.* So alſo *Diodate* on the Text, *verſ.* 27. [*To execute Judgment*;] *namely, to rule and govern*, verſ. 22. [*becauſe he is the Son of Man*;] not only in quality of true everlaſting God, but alſo *of Mediator*, having taken Humane fleſh upon him, *Acts* 17.31. 1 *Cor.* 15.28. in which Nature alſo he is the Fathers Grand-deputy, *Dan.*7.13.

And

And *Grotius* in *v.* 22. *Judicare Mundum Dei est, &c. sed nunc judiciariam potestatem filio dedit*, Acts 17. 31. 1 Pet. 4. 5. *Nempe ubi ipsum Regem constituet*, Apoc. 1. 5. *Nam Regum est judicare*, Psal. 72. 1. &c. *Et illud* κόσμος *recte forte accipias de his quibus Evangelium prædicatum est, &c.* Whether that be right or not, it seems he thought it was Christ's *Mediatory official judgment* that is here meant, and not only his *Deputation* in general. *Vid. eundem* in *vers.* 27, &c. and in *Matth.* 25. 32. So *Pelargus* in *Matth.* 25. 31. *part.* 3. expounds this Text, *Christo datum esse judicium quatenus filius hominis notus est ex* Joh. 5. 22. *quia vero judicem universalem contra tot iniquos judices & mundi principes armatum esse oportet, &c.* And *Paræus* in *Matth.* 25. 31. *Ipse enim constitutus à Deo judex vivorum & mortuorum; quia Pater omne judicium dedit filio, &c.* And no doubt the Judgment there described, is by Christ as *Lord-Redeemer* in his *Kingly Office*, and not merely because his *Humanity* fitteth him to be the Fathers *Delegate quoad executionem.*

Aphorism.

Page 67. *THe suspending of the rigorous Execution of the Sentence of the Law, is the most immediate effect of Christ's death.*

Animadvers.

Though Christ had not died, yet the rigorous execution of the Law (for any thing I see) should have been suspended. For if death had been immediately inflicted on *Adam*, how could Mankind have been propagated by him? [The immediate execution of the full sentence of the Law upon *Adam*, would have prevented the Being, the Sin, and the Suffering of his Posterity;] as your self argues against it, *page* 33.

Reply.

Reply.

1. The *preſent death* of *Adam* would not have been the *rigorous execution of the Law*; (for the Reaſons alledged.) How can you call that the *Rigorous execution*, which would have prevented all the following *ſins* of *Adam* himſelf, and all the ſin and ſuffering of his Poſterity? Do not you in your Rabbinical Commentary, mention their Expoſition of *Morieris*, to be *Reus eris Mortis? &c.* And before out of *Mede*, you make the time to be [*a thouſand years*] that *Adam* ſhould have lived: And you may as probably ſay ſo of [*the day*] that death was threatned him, that it was a ſhortening of that time.

2. If we ſhould ſpeak of God, as of man, that muſt have time for his Conſultations (which is not ſo;) and ſo that while he was conſulting of the terms and way of our Redemption, he ſhould in mere mercy ſuſpend the execution: Yet, 1. That is not the Suſpenſion that I now ſpeak of. 2. Nor is that without reſpect to Redemption, but in order to it (if there were ſuch a thing;) much leſs do I mean a continuance of a ſinful miſerable life, which is a preparative to greater puniſhments, which is rather the *execution* of the Sentence, than the *ſuſpenſion*: But I mean all that which is *properly a ſuſpenſion*, following Chriſt's *interpoſition and undertaking*: That God doth not while they live give them over to as much ſinfulneſs and miſery as they deſerve, and as far abdicate them, and deſert them by the withdrawing of all that may abate their miſery, and that he gives them not over as forſaken to deſpair, and their lives on earth did not preſently begin to be a Hell. If wicked men are freed from deſerved miſery,

misery, and that in a way in it self, tending to their full recovery (but that they wickedly frustrate it) without any procurement of the Mediator, then it seems God can relax his Law, and forbear the full execution, and confer Grace; (*i. e.* Mercy against desert) without *Satisfaction*; which though Dr. *Twiss* affirms, most others do deny. Could I stand on it, I take it to be no hard matter however to prove, that *de Facto* God sheweth no man such Mercies but through Christ.

Aphorism.

NOw they are only Afflictions of love, and not punishments.

Animadvers.

They are not so contradistinct, but that they may be co-incident. Some punishments may be afflictions of love; *viz.* Such as are for the correcting, purging, and reforming of the party punished. Castigatory punishments are Afflictions of love; *Whom I love, I rebuke and chasten*, Rev. 3. 19. *Whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth*, Heb. 12. 6. Some indeed (not only Antinomians, but others also) seem to make Chastisements no judgments or punishments; but the Scripture is clear against them: *When we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord*, &c. 1 Cor. 11. 32. *I will correct thee in measure, yet will I not leave thee wholly unpunished*, Jer. 46. 28.

Reply.

1. You are a favourable Animadverter, who so ordinarily take my part, and defend what I say, under the name of Animadversion. You say as much as I; and in these words have fully expressed the sum of my sense. Only once or twice I carelessly, in compliance with the common Language, use the term [Affliction,] for [Chastisement;] which is all the occasion of exception that I yet see.

2. But

2. But it was a great overſight in you, to impute the alledged opinion or words of thoſe that I oppoſe, to me, as if they were mine. Theſe are my words, [*The common judgment is, That Chriſt hath taken away the whole Curſe (though not the ſuffering) by bearing it himſelf; and now they are only afflictions of love, and not puniſhments. I do not contradict this Doctrine through affectation of ſingularity, but conſtraint of judgment*, &c.] Had it not been very eaſie to know that thoſe are not my words or opinion, which I ſo profeſſedly oppoſe? The ſame which you ſay *ſome*, [*not Antinomians*] hold, I called [*the common judgment:*] For indeed *Peter Martyr*, *Zanchius*, and multitudes of others againſt the Papiſts, beſides late Engliſh Writers, commonly ſay ſo. But yet we have very many accurate Divines that ſay as much as I, and contradict them, as you do: And ſometimes they contradict themſelves. My full ſcope therefore is to prove, that *Chaſtiſements* are a *ſpecies* of *Puniſhment*.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. *IT is undeniable, that Chriſt taking the Curſe on himſelf, did not* wholly *prevent the execution on the Offender*, Gen. 3.7,8,10,15. *&c.*

Animadverſ.

Though thoſe things that befal the Children of God be in their nature evil, and a curſe, yet to them they are not ſuch, becauſe they are ſanctified to them, and made to work together for their good, *Rom.* 8. 28. 1 *Cor.* 11. 32. *Phil.* 1. 22. Poyſon being ſo tempered, as to be an Antidote, is no Poyſon, but a Remedy. Bleſſings to the wicked, become curſes; ſo curſes to the godly, prove bleſſings, *Pſal.* 119. 71.

Reply.

Reply.

Omne malum eſt alicui malum: Aut igitur infligenti, aut patienti: At non infligenti; ergo patienti: If they be *Pœnæ*, they are *malum Pœnæ:* for *Bonum qua tale non eſt Pœna.* But you ſay (out of Scripture) they are *puniſhments.* If you will denominate the whole Work from the ſole prevalent reſpect, effect and end, then they are to be called *Bleſſings:* God's heavy Judgments on *David* for his ſin, was not *malum Pœnæ*, but a *Bleſſing*; ſo you mean, I doubt not: And ſo I agree with you in ſenſe. But if (as you ſhould) you keep ſtill a diſtinct conception of their *penal Nature*, and their *accidentally*-procured *Effect:* Then in regard of the former, you muſt ſtill ſay, they are *mala Pœnæ*; and in regard of the latter, they are Paternal Love-tokens.

Aphoriſm.

Page 70. THey *are aſcribed to God's anger.*

Animadverſ.

But not to his hatred. Anger may conſiſt with *hatred. There is Caſtigatory Anger, as well as Vindicatory, *Iſa.* 57. 17, 18.

* *It ſhould be Love I think.*

Reply.

I have little Reaſon to quarrel with you, when you ſay as I, and almoſt repeat my words.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. THey *are called Puniſhments*, &c.

Animadverſ.

Why then do you diſtinguiſh them from Puniſhments, *Afflictions of Love, and not Puniſhments:* They are (as I have ſhewed) p. 68.

shewed) Castigatory Punishments, but not Vindicatory, or Satisfactory.

Reply.

Why do *you say*, I so distinguish them? merely because I tell you, that I oppose them that do so? I had rather you had made me the Author of your own words, because you and I are both of a mind. But this I know was your overfight in reading, and therefore I pass it.

Aphorism.

Ib. *THe very nature of* * *Affliction, is to be a loving Punishment*, &c.

* Chastisement.

Animadver.

1. This is not consistent with your other words even now cited, wherein you make Afflictions of Love and Punishments contradistinct one to the other.

2. Neither is it true in it self. For are no afflictions incident to the Reprobates? or are they loving Punishments, and sanctified to them?

Reply.

1. You should have said, It is not consistent with the words and Doctrine which I oppose; and that's no wonder.

2. I confest before, that here I put the word [*Afflictions*] instead of [*Chastisements*;] which I will not excuse, though custom may easily make it intelligible: For that Language is not singular. If therefore you mean it of Afflictions in general, I doubt not but they are more incident to the Reprobates than any; or else they should not be damned. If you mean it of [*Chastisements*,] I answer, 1. As God in a larger sence may be called the Father of all those to whom he sheweth mercy, provideth for them, beareth with them, offereth them Christ, and

and Grace, giveth them in his Covenant of Grace a conditional Adoption; and ſo far he may be called the Father of Mankind, or of Reprobates (as many Divines on the Preface of the Lord's Prayer:) And ſo far he may be ſaid to love them, and to chaſtiſe them. But not in that ſtrict ſence, as he is the Father of Believers, and loveth and chaſtiſeth them.

2. So far as God *doth good* to Reprobates, he loveth them. But he doth them good, he giveth them mercy. Elſe they never ſin againſt mercy, which who dare ſay? therefore they may partake of loving puniſhments; no doubt puniſhments may do them good.

3. Yet will I not ſay, that theſe are *ſanctified* to them. As if there were *no good* below that of *Sanctification*: But if you will needs extend the word [*ſanctified*] to *all good*, I contend not. But till God lay by his Philanthropy, I will not ſay, he loves not all men, at leaſt, in this life.

4. And if you had put the caſe of [*Unbelievers*,] and not only of [*Reprobates*] it might eaſily have appeared, that they are *loving puniſhments* to *many Unbelievers*; *viz.* to the Elect before Converſion (as *Paul*'s ſtriking down by the way, and *Manaſſeh*'s chains were, *&c.*) for they are means of their Converſion; and in ſome ſence may be ſaid to be ſanctified to them, and in another not. And yet God is not then ſtrictly their Father (for they are not adopted till they receive Chriſt by Faith, *John* 1. 10, 11.) and therefore they are not ſo fatherly Chaſtiſements. Where alſo you ſee, that it is not Chriſt's mere bearing the Curſe for men, that makes it no Curſe, or evil to them: For it is evil

and a Curſe to many of the Elect, before Converſion, for whom yet Chriſt died.

Aphoriſm.

THerefore to ſay; that Chriſt hath taken away the Curſe and Evil, and not the ſuffering, is a contradiction.

Animadverſ.

Not ſo, ſeeing ſuffering, though ſanctified, is ſuffering ſtill; but ſo is it not ſtill evil and a curſe, becauſe now it works for the good of thoſe to whom it is ſanctified; even as bitter pills and potions work for the good of ſick perſons.

Reply.

1. By [*Curſe*] I mean, only the *effect of the Commination of the Law of Nature violated*, commonly called [*the Curſe:*] I do not mean that which makes a man ſo unhappy, as we uſe to call men [*Curſed*] for.

2. If ſanctified ſuffering be not ſtill *malum*, then it is not *malum pœnæ*; and then it is not *pœna* [which is a *natural evil inflicted for the defect of Moral good*:] But you maintain it to be *pœna*.

3. It's a natural evil effecting accidentally a greater Good. Here it remains ſtill a *natural evil* when ſanctified. The ſanctifying takes not away all the *natural evil*; but by a leſs evil preventeth a greater. Death is not *bonum naturale*, becauſe *ſanctified*. Pain is pain ſtill, *& malum vel diſconveniens naturæ*, and *puniſhment* ſtill: The *good* is *accidental* to the puniſhment, and therefore makes it nevertheleſs to be *pœna, vel malum per ſe*, though at the ſame time it be by accident *majus bonum*. What is it that is accidentally good? is it not *malum pœnæ?* If ſo, it remaineth *malum pœnæ* ſtill, or elſe you cannot ſay that *malum pœnæ* is accidentally good. And when

all

all is done, it is but an improper ſpeech to ſay, that *Death* and *Pain* are *good*, becauſe they are *accidentally* made the *means* of our good. The goodneſs is properly in their *end*, and *accidental effect* (and the Sanctifier) rather than in them: And therefore they are more properly ſaid to be *ſubmitted* to for the good that followeth them, than *deſired* or *loved*: It is not *Pain*, or *Death*; but *Grace* and *God* that I muſt *love*. Whereas, were they *good* indeed themſelves, they might be *loved* themſelves.

I do leave out the far greateſt part of the Explication of my meaning on this ſubject, becauſe I did it lately and largely on the Animadverſions of another Learned Brother; and I am backward to repetitions, becauſe it is moſt for my own information that I examine your Animadverſions.

I will not contend with you about theſe phraſes; but only I would adviſe you, that you take heed of arguing thus: That which works for our good is ſanctified to us, and ſo is no more evil: But ſin worketh to our good; therefore it is ſanctified, and is no more evil, but good.

Aphoriſm.

WHat Reaſon can be given, why God ſhould not do us all that good without our ſufferings, which now he doth by them, if there were not ſin and wrath, and Law in them.

Animadverſ.

1. Indeed if there were no ſin, there ſhould be no affliction; as if there were no ſickneſs, there ſhould be no medicine: Yet is not the *Medicine evil*, and a curſe to the ſick; neither is affliction to God's children.

2. The Scripture doth shew us other reasons of our suffering; as, to conform us to *Christ*, Rom. 8. 29. with 17. to try us, 1 *Pet.* 4. 12. *Rev.* 2. 10. & 3. 10. and for the manifestation of God's glory, *John* 9. 3.

Reply.

1. An over-seeing Answer. The *Question* is of sins interest as the *efficient meritorious Cause*: The *Answer* is of sin as the *terminus amovendus*, or *privatio finis*. We do not differ in that, Whether the *curing of sin* be the *end of Chastisement?* but where it is so, yet, Whether *sin* be not the *meritorious Cause*, so far as it is *evil?* You might better have instanced in *Chastisement*, than *medicining* of Children. No wise Father chastiseth his Child, but his *fault* is the *meritorious Cause*, as well as the *final (Reductive)* (his *Reformation* I mean.) You might therefore as truly have said, [There would be no Chastisement, if there were no *sin meriting* it,] as, [If there be no sin to be *cured by* it.] It is *essential* to *Punishment* (of which *Chastisement* is a *species*) that it be [*for sin as the meritorious Cause, really or supposed.*]

2. Your other assigned Reasons therefore are no Reasons; for they belong to the *final Cause*, and not to the *efficient*. And you do but leave me to renew my Question, What reason can you give, why God should have attained all those good ends (our Tryal, Conformity, his Glory, *&c.*) *without* our suffering, which now he attaineth by it, if *sin* were not the *meritorious Cause?* and *some wrath* still in it? specially, when God hath fully told us, that *he afflicts not willingly*; that *man* suffereth but *for his sin*; that *for the iniquity of* Jacob *is all this*, &c. and that he will not afflict his Creature without its desert.

deſert. If by [*Conformity to Chriſt*] you mean not to his *Holineſs*, but to his *Suffering*: I anſwer, That is *no good* to us of it ſelf, but an *evil*: For it was the *evil of Puniſhment* that we deſerved that he bore; and therefore if it be a good to be therein conformed to him, then it is good to bear God's Vindictive wrath. Indeed we may have comfort in our ſuffering, in that we ſuffer but what Chriſt hath ſuffered (in ſeveral reſpects that I need not ſtand on:) But the good is, that our Conformity in ſuffering, tends to make us conform in Holineſs, and ſo in Glory, in our meaſure.

Aphoriſm.

Page 71. *THe ſufferings of the godly, proceed from a mixture of love and anger, &c.*

Animadverſ.

Love and Anger are not oppoſite, but Love and Hatred: And you preſently ſay, There is no hatred, though there be anger.

Reply.

They are not *fully oppoſite*, nor inconſiſtent; elſe I ſhould not think Chaſtiſement is from both. But ſure there is ſome oppoſition: Let their Objects be judg. The Object of *Love*, is [*Preſent Good*;] the Object of *Anger*, is [*Preſent Evil.*] Is here no oppoſition? Indeed *Ira* being in the Iraſcible *circa malum præſens arduum*, and there being not any *bonum præſens arduum*, hath no perfect contrary.

But what you here diſlike, or wherein we diſagree, you give me not to underſtand. But how you will reconcile your Conceſſion here, with your former ſpeech, that [Sanctified Suffering is not

evil,] I know not. For surely if it proceed from *Anger* in any part, so far sin is the Cause (and the fruit of sin is to us evil,) and the effects of Anger, as such, will be evil, *malum pœnæ*, to us. As therefore it comes fron *sin*, and God's *Anger*, it still continueth *evil to us*: But as it comes from Christ's *Blood*, and God's *Love*, it is *good Accidentally and Eventually*, and the good to us is greater than the evil.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Death is one of the Enemies that is not yet overcome*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 15. 26.

Animadverf.

Though Death be not fully and perfectly overcome till the Resurrection, yet to the godly it it not *evil*, nor a *curse*. The sting of it, *viz.* Sin, being taken away, it cannot hurt, but only convey unto a better life: *To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain*, Phil. 1. 21. *The sting of Death is sin, and the strength*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 15. 56, 57.

Reply.

1. This is answered already.

2. I confess the sting is taken out.

3. But if it be not evil; then, 1. How is it yet [*an Enemy?*] an Enemy, and no evil! 2. Why do you confess it a *Punishment?* If the sanctifying remove *all* the *evil*, and removeth the *penalty*, *Good* is no *punishment*. 3. Then it is a sin to have *any fear of*, *or averseness to Death*; (which I believe not.) For *good* cannot be the object of *timor* or *fuga*. 4. If it *hurt not* (as you affirm) why do men *groan* and *fear* it, and seek to avoid it? How doth sense deceive us, if *pain hurt not?* 5. Then why doth God make promises of *longer life*, and of *recovery from sickness?* And why doth he *threaten death*, and *pain*, and *shame*, and *loss?* &c. Is *good*, as such, the

the matter of *Threatnings?* 6. Then you may dare to forbear lamenting under God's afflicting-ing hand, or taking notice of it as an evil, and ſign of his diſpleaſure! 7. And then you may dare to ſay, that you are not beholden to God for delivering you from any evil of ſuffering! For if it had come (as ſickneſs, death, *&c.*) it would have been no evil. 8. Yea, it would rather be an evil to you, to ſave you from them, if they be merely good. 9. Then you need (yea may) *not pray* againſt *evil* of ſuffering; for none may pray againſt *good* as *good.* 10. Then the godly are uncapable of *Chaſtiſements*, becauſe they are uncapable of *evil.* But I ſuppoſe you will take heed of theſe Conſequents. But enough of this.

It is *gain* to *die* accidentally: Not becauſe death is *not evil*, but becauſe it leads to a greater good: That which is called Deaths ſting, is not all the evil of it.

Aphoriſm.

THe whole ſtream of Scripture, maketh Chriſt to manage that which lieth on us for our advantage and good.

Animadverſ.

If it be ſo managed, though in it ſelf ſimply conſidered it be evil, yet to us as ſo managed, it is good.

Reply.

It is evil to ſome-body, or not evil. It is not evil to it ſelf, though in it ſelf to us. It is *per ſe malum pœnæ to us*; it is *per accidens good.* I doubt not but you will ſubſcribe to this Explication, and that we in judgment agree.

Aphorism.

Page 79. I *Know that it is the judgment of learned and godly men, that the Law as a Covenant of Works, is quite* null *and repealed, in regard of the sins of Believers.*

Animadverſ.

They mean (I ſuppoſe) ſo as that Believers are not to be tried by the Law, to ſtand or fall by it. See *Rom.* 6.14. *Gal.* 3.13. & 5.18.23. Your ſelf ſays, page 81. [*The alteration is not made in the Law, but in our eſtate and relation to the Law.*] This is enough. Our eſtate and relation to the Law is not now ſuch, as that we ſhould either be juſtified or condemned by it. The Law, as a Covenant, ſaith, *Do this and live*, Rom. 10. 5. and, *Curſed is every one that continueth not*, &c. *Gal.* 3.10. Believers are not to live or die upon ſuch terms; and therefore they are not under the Law as a Covenant of Works.

Reply.

This is a point of great difficulty and moment. I agree with your ſence (if I underſtand you) wherein I have hitherto been happy almoſt all along. But what made you think that I oppoſe men that were of my own mind? Indeed they are two ſorts that I here oppoſe: 1. Thoſe that uſe conſtantly to ſay, *The Law is abrogated, as to the condemning power of it, to Believers: But not to others, nor to them, as to the commanding power.* Theſe (if Truth may take place of Modeſty) are the common ſort of thoſe Divines that I have met with, that never ſtudied the nature of Laws, and underſtand not what Abrogation is, nor how they contradict themſelves in ſaying, It is abrogated to Believers, &c. When *Abrogation* is the proper *annulling* of a Law; and when it is *null* or *abrogate*, it can oblige *none*. 2. Thoſe that better underſtand themſelves in Politicks, and ſay,

ſay, that the *Covenant of Works is abrogated properly, that is, nulled*, ſo *that no man in the World is under it.* This is a very hard, yet weighty Controverſie. I ſhall ſay little of it with you; 1. Becauſe you agree with me. 2. I have newly writ largely of it with a very Learned Neighbour-Brother, Mr. *G. Lawſon* (a man as accurately verſt in Politicks as any Miniſter I know) this being the main ſubject of a larger Conteſt between him and me; wherein I confeſs he puts me harder to it than any man that I have dealt with, and I have received much light from his Animadverſions.

Aphoriſm.

Page 82. *AND abſolute Diſcharge is granted to none in this Life: For even when we do perform the Condition, yet ſtill the Diſcharge remains conditional, till we have quite finiſhed our performance.*

Animadverſ.

There is ſuch an abſolute Diſcharge granted to ſome in this life, that there is no Condemnation belonging to them, *Rom.* 8. 1. *They have peace with God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, Rom.* 5. 1. *they have everlaſting life*, viz. begun in them.

Reply.

Yet we agree. I am wholly of your mind. But, 1. Our Diſcharge *before believing*, is conditional, as to *beginning* and *end*; and therefore not *actual*: (For *quod eſt in conditione, non eſt in obligatione: Et conditionale nihil ponit in eſſe.*) 2. Our Diſcharge *upon our believing* is *abſolute* and *actual quoad primam poſſeſſionem*: But it is ſtill *conditional quoad continuationem & conſummationem*, till we have finiſhed our courſe, overcome, and endured to the end. Yet it may be ſure in *God's Decree* of upholding,

ing us, that we may persevere, though it be conditional in the Law, or Testamental-Grant. For it is false which some assert, that, If the Condition be *certain*, it is *no Condition*, but *absolute*. For if it be *contingent* it sufficeth, though *foreknown* by the Donor.

Aphorism.

Page 83. IF *this were not so, but Christ hath abrogated the first Covenant*, &c.

Animadverf.

Your Reasons prove, that the first Covenant is still in force, but not that Believers are still under that Covenant, so as that either their Justification or Condemnation depend on it.

Reply.

1. I now say, the first Covenant is ceased. 2. Then they prove all that I desire. But why their Justification and Condemnation depends not on it, when yet the Law is in force, is worth the explicating.

Aphorism.

Ibid. WHat *the Law in force doth not threaten, that is not explicitely deserved, or due by Law.*

Animadverf.

The Law doth *threaten*, but it cannot *execute* upon *Believers* what it threatneth: Christ hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, *Gal.* 3. 13. *The strength of sin is the Law, but thanks be to God who hath given us the Victory through our Lord Jesus Christ*, 1 Cor. 15. 56, 57.

Reply.

Still we agree as to the Law *de futuro*: But I confess Mr. *L*'s Arguments are yet very knotty.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *IT would follow that Christ died not to prevent or remove the Wrath and Curse, so deserved and due to us, for any but* Adam's *sin; nor to pardon our sins at all, but only to prevent our desert of Wrath and curse; and consequently to prevent our need of pardon.*

Animadvers.

The Law is yet in force to shew us sin, and the desert of it; but not to condemn us for it, if we be in Christ, who hath satisfied the Law for us, and freed us from the Curse of it.

Reply.

I accept your Concession. But, 1. The Law concurs to the *Constitution* of *Guilt*, as well as to the *Manifestation*. 2. I suppose you speak *de condemnatione efficaci condemnationi judicii inseparabiliter connexâ*; and so it is true, else not: For the Law doth *condemn* us, *quantum in se*, before Christ do pardon us *per legem Remediantem*. 3. We are freed by Christ's Satisfaction, only when the fruits of it are conferred on us; that is on our believing, but not on the mere payment. So your sense.

Aphorism.

Page 85. *THe New-Covenant threatneth not death to any sin, but final Unbelief; or at least to no sin without final Unbelief.*

Animadvers.

I grant that the New-Covenant, promising Life on condition of Believing, may be said to threaten death only in case of final Unbelief; that is, except one continue in Unbelief unto the end, he shall not perish: 1. Yet when it is said, that *Christ will come in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ,*

2 Theſſ. 1. 7, 8. I conceive, that by *obeying the Goſpel*, is meant obeying the *Moral Law*, to which even the Goſpel it ſelf doth require obedience, *Matth.* 5. 17, 18, 19. & 1 *Cor.* 9. 21. & *Tit.* 2. 11, 12. So that ſuch as tranſgreſs the *Moral Law*, are liable to death, not only *by the Law*, but alſo by *the Goſpel*, though the Goſpel withal hold out pardon to thoſe that believe, which the Law doth not. 2. Beſides, few (I think) will deny, that the Old-Covenant is ſtill of uſe to let us ſee what is due unto us for ſin, and what need we have of Chriſt. But when it is ſaid, that Believers are freed from the Law as a Covenant of Works; the meaning is, that they are not tied to thoſe ſtrict terms which are contained in that Covenant, namely, to obtain life upon condition of full and perfect obedience to the Law, or otherwiſe for any the leaſt Tranſgreſſion to incur eternal Damnation.

Reply.

This is the great Point that ſo many oppoſe; wherein yet you agree with me. 1. It is not only an *implicite* Threatning (implied in the Promiſe) to Unbelievers; but an *explicite*. 2. I believe not, that by the *Goſpel of Chriſt*, 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 7, 8. is meant *directly* the *Moral Law*, *as ſuch*: But obedience to the *Moral Law*, is *implied* in it, ſo far as it is the *Law of Chriſt*, to be *ſincerely* obeyed, as a conſequent of Faith, and implied in Faith. 3. I yet diſcern not that any is liable, or virtually-adjudged to death by the *New-Law* (as diſtinct from that of Works) for *Unbelief* or *Diſobedience*, but on ſuppoſition that they be *final*. Indeed, whether it be *final* or *not*, men are at preſent children of Wrath that remain impenitent: But that is, becauſe they are ſo by the *Law of Works*, and the Law of Grace hath *not yet delivered* them; but it ſaith not, that *they ſhall not be delivered*, but on ſuppoſal of perſeverance to the end in that Impenitency. 4. The Old-Covenant is not only of

uſe

uſe to let us *ſee our Due:* but firſt to *conſtitute that Due*, and then to *manifeſt it*.

Aphoriſm.

Page 86. *Scripture plainly teacheth, That all men, even the Elect, are under the Law, till they believe.*

Animadverſ.

True: But not *after* they believe, as you ſeem to hold, p. 78, & 79. you plainly declare your ſelf to diſſent from thoſe learned and godly men, who exempt Believers from the Law, as a Covenant of Works. Yet you yield as much as they (I preſume) deſire. *V.* 87. you cite the words of the Apoſtle, *They that are led by the Spirit, are not under the Law, and againſt ſuch there is no Law*, Gal. 5. 18, 23. *Page* 88. you ſay, [The Obligation to Puniſhment is dead as to us. *Rom.* 7. 6. but not the Law void or dead in it ſelf. I know not why any ſhould deſire more than is here granted: Neither do I believe, that thoſe learned and godly men whom yet you profeſs your ſelf to diſſent from, did intend more.

Reply.

1. The intent of the firſt ſort of them cannot be known by their words; for they are ſelf-contradictory. The intent of the ſecond ſort is for much more; as you would be quickly brought to believe, if you did but read ſome Volumes of Papers written to me on this ſubject.

2. I am glad that I ſo far agree with you, that you can ſo hardly believe that any others differ from me (that are godly and learned.)

3. For my ſeeming to make Believers under the Law. I anſwer, So do you. They are *ſo far* under the Law, that it maketh *them guilty*, that is, obligeth them to puniſhment; which is *Condemnatio Legis*: But this *guilt*, as it accrues, is *remitted*; and this *Obligation* diſſolved, when contracted; and this

this *Condemnatio Legis*, shall never procure the *Condemnationem Judicis*, because there is in force, and still at hand *superaddita Lex Gratiæ Remedians*, dissolving the foresaid Obligation.

This is in brief my judgment of that great point. I dare not yield to them that say, *The Law is abrogated (de Futuro;)* nor to ordinary Divines, to say, *It is abrogated to Believers*, lest I should utterly deny a possibility of any pardon, by denying all reality of guilt: For where there is no *actual guilt* (though there may be Potential and Conditional, as some speak) there is no place for pardon. Where there is no Obligation, there can be no dissolving of that which is not.

Aphorism.

Page 89. *Whosoever will repent, and believe in him to the end, shall be justified*, &c.

Animadvers.

No doubt, as in other Graces, so in Faith, perseverance is required. *Now the just shall live by faith: But if any man draw back, my Soul shall have no pleasure in him*, Heb. 10. 38. Yet Justification is promised simply to them that believe: *By him all that believe are justified*, Acts 13. 39. It is not suspended till a man be a Believer to the end. You will say, The continuance of Justification doth depend on the continuance of believing. I grant it: But true justifying Faith is never lost, nor true Justification ever reversed. *Whom he justifieth, them he also glorifieth*, Rom. 8. 30.

Reply.

Still we agree. 1. As if you marry a Beggar, your Riches and Honor is hers *inceptively*, or *quoad primam possessionem (& primum Jus)* on her *consent* or *Marriage*-Covenant: But the *continuance* is on condition of *continuing that consent* and *fidelity*. Our *first*, or *begun-actual Justification* in *Law* is on our

first

first believing; but both the *continuance* and *consummation*, and the great Justification by *Sentence at Judgment*, and the benefit of *Glory* to be adjudged us thereupon, are all on condition of our perseverance and overcoming. 2. That justifying Faith is never lost, nor Justification hath any intercision, doth not contradict, but very well suit with the necessity of the said perseverance in Faith, as the condition of continued and consummate Justification. The Decree of God causeth that perseverance: But yet the Law (being the Rule for man to live by, and God to judg by, and not the opener of all his counsels) doth not (as a Law) alway take notice of that. As God's Decree is, that all the Elect shall believe, and yet his *Law* doth most fitly require Faith of them, as the condition of their Justification and Glory.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *And be moreover advanced to far greater Priviledges and Glory than they fell from.*

Animadvers.

This seemeth to imply, that only an outward and earthly happiness was promised in the first Covenant, to which I have spoken before.

Reply.

It neither implieth, nor seemeth to imply any such thing, if by [*outward and earthly,*] you mean *objectivè & materialiter*, consisting of outward and terrene blessings only. But whether *Adam*'s high enjoyment of God, should have been on Earth, or in Heaven, I cannot tell. I will not pretend to be wiser than I am.

Aphorism.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. *And for their neglect of that, ſhall ſuffer far greater Condemnation.*

Animadverſ.

Not in kind, but only in degree, as I have alſo ſhewed before.

Reply.

1. That's all that I urge and deſire you to yield to. The ſcratch of a pin, and the pulling off a mans fleſh with pincers, are pains that differ not in kind, but degree: Yet in a Civil or Law ſence, they differ *in kind:* For ſo a *natural gradual difference*, may conſtitute a *Civil or Moral ſpecifick* difference.

2. Yet, if *pœna damni* be any *pœna*, your Aſſertion is not beyond diſpute. For to be an adopted ſon in Chriſt, and a member of the Son of God, and one with him who is one with the Father, are priviledges which I cannot prove that *Adam* ſhould have enjoyed, if he had not ſinned, nor any of their kind.

Aphoriſm.

Page 91. Jer. 31. 31, *&c.* Heb. 8. 8, *&c. containeth not the full tenor of the whole New-Covevenant: But either it is called the New-Covenant, becauſe it expreſſeth the nature of the benefits of the New-Covenant, as they are offered on God's part, without mentioning mans conditions,* &c.

Animadverſ.

What conditions on mans part can be aſſigned, which are not implied, *Jer.* 31. 33. & *Heb.* 8. 10. *I will put my Law in their inward parts, and will write it in their hearts?* Where alſo it is expreſſed that God will work theſe conditions which he doth require; as preſently here you acknowledg, ſaying, *Or elſe*

else it speaketh only of what God will do for his Elect in giving them the first Grace, and enabling them to perform the conditions of the New-Covenant.

Reply.

* *Memorandum*, That I have over, and over, and over professed my self of your judgment, as you confess, and I have fullier elsewhere expressed. Only taking it for more difficult than sometime I have done, I hold it not as so clear and certain a truth, but that in modesty I may take in the other opinion. If I must therefore argue against my self and you: I answer you, 1. If it should be but the Confirmation, Radication, or further degree of Grace that is here meant, then your Answer may be at hand. 2. What condition on mans part is there, that is not comprehended in circumcising the heart to love the Lord, and the heart of their seed? and yet it is promised *conditionally*, Deut. 31.3. What condition on mans part is there, that is not comprized in the gift of the *Holy Ghost*? Yet God giveth his *Holy Spirit* to them that ask it. And how oft is the Holy Ghost said to be given to them that *believe*? And Christ promiseth, *Prov.* 1. *Turn ye at my reproof, and* [*I will pour out my Spirit unto you.*] But this is against my self and you.

* Since the writing of this, the Context satisfieth me, that these Texts speak not of the first Grace.

Aphorism.

Page 95. HE *never maketh a relative change, where he doth not make a real also.*

Animadvers.

1. Yet in your Animadversions on Mr. *Bedford* about Baptism, you seem to hold a Relative change in Infants, without

any real change in them; *viz.* That they are justified and freed from the guilt of sin, and yet are not *sanctified*, as we usually take the word, by the infusion of Grace into the Soul. I cannot see but that generally, as well in Infants as others, Justification and Sanctification, in that sence, go together, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *Rom.* 8. 9.

2. But to take your words in the full latitude and extent of them, they seem not true: For in the members of the visible Church, generally there is a relative change; they have special relation to God; and yet in many of them there is no real change; *i. e.* they are no more inwardly holy than mere Aliens.

Reply.

I confess you have now met with me: I ought to have spoken so cautelously, that my speech might not have been so obnoxious to a misinterpretation. But yet thus far I may justly Apologize: 1. I did not mean it of Infants or Ideots, but only of the Aged and Rational. 2. I plainly speak of a real change only, as necessary to give title to the relative. And I do not see yet, but this is true of all, for all your two Exceptions. And first for Infants, I answered, 1. They have not the relations of [*justified, adopted Church-member*, &c.] but upon a *real change* or work, to give them title: But that work is on the *Parents* (and not requisite in themselves) which gives title both to Parent and Child to the relative benefits. I said not, that [*God never makes a relative change, where he makes not a real on the same person.* 2. And for my judgment against Mr. *Bedford:* 1. I do shew my doubtfulness in that point: I have proved the *relative* change on Infants; when you have proved the *real* on them to be as *common*, then I will yield to you, and thank you. But you must be pleased to consider withal, how to resolve the difficulties on the other side; and answer both the

Arguments

Arguments of the Fathers, and Mr. *Bedford*, and *Davenant*, and *Ward*, &c. which are brought to prove the efficacy of Baptism to its just end *non-ponenti obicem*, if you deny the ordinary relative change on Infants: or if you yield it, but withal maintain the certain concurrence of an infusion of Grace (as you speak) even into them that after perish; then be pleased to prove, that such true Sanctification (for so you call it) may be lost (which seems to be against your judgment) and answer the rest of my Arguments against Mr. *Bedford*. It is easie enough to see inconveniences seeming to clog an Opinion: But we must withal consider the inconveniencies of the contrary Opinion. If you maintain, that the Child of a true Believer, presented to God by Baptism, according to his Ordinance, in Prayer and Faith by the Parents, doth not receive Remission of sin (certainly;) I think you must either say, that *Remission is not an end of the Ordinance*, and so it is not a Seal of Remission, or of the Remitting-Covenant of Grace (which is not true;) or else, that *God's Ordinances may miss of their ends, without mans causing-fault*; and that God's Covenant to his People and their Seed, may be broken; or else (encline to the Anabaptists, and say) that *All the Seed of true Believers are not in the Covenant of Grace* with God, nor should be baptized; and *we know not which of them it is that are in Covenant*: Or else devise another Covenant of Grace, containing only *Church priviledges*, and not *Remission* (which some call an *external Covenant*) as to the benefit promised; and say, that the Seed of Believers are only in this, and Baptism sealeth only to this: Which leaveth the Children of Be-

lievers in as hopeleſs a caſe as the Anabaptiſts leave them: which contradicteth Scripture, which appointeth Baptiſm for higher ends, *viz.* for Remiſſion of ſins; and which hath given the Anabaptiſts that advantage to inſult, by playing upon that new-deviſed Covenant; and even baffle us, when we cannot prove it from Scripture, and ſo doth much harden them, and encreaſe their number (as I know by experience of them.)

For the Text you cite, that 1 *Cor.* 6.11. ſpeaks expreſly of the Aged; and I think ſo doth that *Rom.* 8.9. The Word ſaith alſo, *He that believeth not, ſhall be damned*, and yet that is not extended to *Infants*. Beſides, thoſe Infants that have only *Remiſſion*, and not the *Spirit*, will loſe it (this may be ſaid;) and therefore are not Chriſt's in that ſtrict ſence, as thoſe that have *both*. If you ſay, What if they die in Infancy? Thoſe of that judgment will anſwer you, That then (if the Parents were true Believers) it is a certain ſign that they had the *Spirit* as well as Remiſſion. So much of Infants.

2. And for your ſecond Exception, I reply, 1. My ſpeech fully ſhews, that I meant not *all Relations*, but only *ſaving-Relations*; as, *Remiſſion*, *Juſtification*, *Adoption*, &c. But yet I ſee no appearance of ſtrength againſt it in your Argument, if I *had* meant ſo. For is there *no real change* in the members of the *viſible* Church? Of *Infants* I have ſpoke before: And if there be none in the reſt, then the Church differs little from the Pagan World, if they differ *only in Relation*; and then any man may be be baptized, whether he *profeſs Repentance and Faith* or not? Is the *ſolemn Profeſſion of believing in Chriſt*, and *repenting of all ſin*, and *covenanting* to

forſake

forſake the World, Fleſh and Devil, and to fight under Chriſt's Banner faithfully to the death, is this no Real change?

But I know you will ſay, It is not true Sanctification.

I reply, 1. Our Queſtion is only of a *real change*, and not of *true Sanctification*. 2. As their *real change* is not true Sanctification, but *Profeſſion*, or a *common* change; ſo their *relative change* is not *true Juſtification*, but to be annumerated to viſible Profeſſors, and partake of common Priviledges. Not becauſe the Covenant of God doth contain no more, or that they enter any other Covenant; but becauſe they perform not the conditions requiſite to the participation of more, in that they do not ſincerely accept the terms of the Covenant, and accordingly re-engage themſelves to Chriſt.

Aphoriſm.

Page 103. HE *muſt have a twofold Righteouſneſs, anſwerable to the two Covenants, that expecteth to be juſtified.* (vid. locum.)

Animadverſ.

You ſpeak of a twofold Righteouſneſs, requiſite and neceſſary unto Juſtification; but (ſo far as I can judg) this Doctrine is not founded upon Scripture. For that ſhews us, that Chriſt's Satisfaction merely is the Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, though Faith be required on our part, that it may be imputed to us as ours, that ſo we may be juſtified by it. Faith is the condition whereby we are made partakers of that Righteouſneſs, *viz.* Chriſt's Satisfaction; and in that reſpect we are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith, *Rom.* 5.1. with *Acts* 13.39. But that Faith is a diſtinct Righteouſneſs, by which, together with Chriſt's Satisfaction, we muſt be juſtified, ſeems to be as if we ſhould make the Medicine and the applying of it two things co-ordinate each with other, when as the one is but ſubordinate and ſubſervient, as it were, to the other, to work the cure; the

Medicine being to no purpose, except it be applied. It cannot, I think, properly be said, that we are cured partly by the Medicine, and partly by the Application, but by the Medicine as applied: So neither is it proper to say, that we are justified partly by Christ's Satisfaction, and partly by Faith, each of them being a distinct Righteousness whereby we are justified, but that we are justified by Christ's Satisfaction as our only Righteousness in that respect; yet not by it simply considered; but as that whereby it is made ours, that we may be justified by it.

Reply.

You come now a little nearer the quick; and therein seem very strongly to dissent from me: But when all is examined, it proves most but in words, while you grant in sense all, or most that I desire. Yet because this is a point of so great moment, and you think here lieth my πρῶτον ψεύδος, I think necessary to handle it more fully. And because you pass over (without taking notice of it) the Explication of my sence of Righteousness, I must briefly repeat it.

It is not the *particular Vertue* called *Justice*, by which we give *suum cuiq;* distributively or commutatively, which we now are handling. It is *in sensu forensi* that we speak of *Righteousness* and *Justification*. And in that sense, Righteousness is either *causæ vel personæ*. The *persons Righteousness* is joyned in the Righteousness of his *Cause*, and ever supporteth it. The *Cause* is sometime only *one Action* or *Habit*, or some *few* only; and then the *person* is justified but *secundum quid*, or as to *that Action* of which he was accused, and no further (by the Righteousness of that his *Cause*.) Sometime the Cause is *all a mans Actions* or *Dispositions* which are called in question, which he is put to justifie:

ſie: And if he juſtifie *all*, he *fully* juſtifieth *the perſon*, which is called *Juſtificatio perſonæ* in the moſt uſual ſenſe of that phraſe. But yet a mans *Cauſe* may lye in other things than *Actions* or *Diſpoſitions*: (of which anon) and he may have other ways to be juſtified.

The *Righteouſneſs* in queſtion is contrary to *guilt*. *Guilt* is twofold, 1. *Reatus culpæ*. 2. *Reatus pœnæ*: The firſt ſo called, in reference to the *Precept* or *Prohibition*: The ſecond, in reference directly to the *Sanction*.

So is there a *twofold Righteouſneſs*, and in either of them is conſiderable, both the *form*, and the *quaſi-materia*. The *Precept* commandeth to do, or not do. He that *obeyeth accordingly*, is *righteous*, and not *reus culpæ*. The *Sanction* containeth *Promiſes* and *Comminations*, or determineth *de præmiis & pœnis*: He that is not *obligatus ad pœnam*, is righteous in reſpect to the *Commination*; and he that hath *jus ad præmium*, is *righteous* as to the *premiant act* of the Law.

As *Juſtification* ſuppoſeth *Accuſation*; ſo *Righteouſneſs* ſuppoſeth (in the *Judicial* ſenſe of the word) a *poſſibility* of *Accuſation*.

As the Law conſiſteth of theſe two parts (the *preceptive* (*de agendo vel non agendo*) and the *Sanction*;) ſo there is a *twofold Accuſation* that we are liable to: 1. That *we have ſinned*, or have *Reatum culpæ*. 2. And that we are therefore *Obligati ad pœnam*, and have no title to the Reward. To be righteous, in reſpect of the *former Accuſation* (if it be according to the Law of Works at leaſt, that we are accuſed, or (as I think) the Law of Grace either) is to be *Non-peccator*, or to be *Innocent*. To

be righteous, in respect to the *latter Accusation*, is to be *Non-obligatus ad pœnam*, or *non-condemnandus*; or *to be rewarded*, if the Accuser deny his title to the Reward: Or, if this last be questionable, whether [*Just*] signifie [*Rewardable?*] yet none can question the former, Whether it signifie [*non-obligatus ad pœnam.*]

The *formal* nature of [*Righteousness*] therefore is *relative*: Even such a transcendental relation is it, as is *Reatus*, to which it is opposed; and as *Debitum* is, which is the common formal nature of all proper *Morality*. And for the *fundamentum* and *subject* of this relation: The *first subject* of *Righteousness* which is opposed to *Reatus culpæ*, is *Actio vel Actionis suspensio* (under which is comprized the *Disposition*:) And *from* the *Action*, it resulteth to the *Agent* or *Person*, who is the *last subject* of it: The *Person* is therefore righteous (in this first sense) because his *actions* and *dispositions* are righteous.

The *subject* of the *latter sort* of Righteousness (which is opposite to *Reatus pœnæ*) is *only* the *person*.

The *immediate fundamentum* of the *former* Righteousness, as it is *personæ*, is the *justitia actionum & dispositionum*, as being *his own*: And so it is a *relation* founded in a *relation*, and *both Moral*.

The *immediate fundamentum* of the Righteousness of his *actions*, is yet *another relation*; viz. Their *Conformity* to the *Precept* or *Rule* (considering this Conformity *in esse Reali*, as it is presupposed to the *esse Morale*.) For it is presupposed, that my *action* be the same that is commanded, considering both the *Command* and *Action* merely *in genere entis*, before we consider that *action* as *debitum*

tum in generis moris: And the *fundamentum* of this relation of *Conformity*, is immediately the *proportio quantitativa vel perfectio adæquata actionum quoad regulam.* So that the *remote fundamentum* of this *Conformity*, is the ſame with the *ſubjectum*, that is, the *Actions themſelves*, or *the Diſpoſitions*: *Et ita remotè fundatur in actione & qualitate*: And the *neareſt fundamentum* is that *degree* and *number of actions*, wherein conſiſteth that perfection which is the *Adæquation* to the Rule; and ſo it is founded *in quantitate vel graduali perfectione.* For this *Conformity* containeth, as it were, a conjunction of a twofold *relation*, that is, *ſimilitude (remotius)* and *equality (propius.)* So much of that firſt Righteouſneſs, which is a *Conformity* to the *Precept* as *Precept.*

Where obſerve next, that this is none of our Righteouſneſs, as I have proved, I think, in the Aphoriſms: That we have *no ſuch Righteouſneſs*, as in *our own Works*, is beyond doubt among all good Chriſtians. And that we have *no ſuch Righteouſneſs of Chriſt* (in this *form*, or as ſuch) imputed to us ſtrictly, and in it ſelf, I perceive you and I are agreed. (Though I will not be ſo peremptory as to condemn them that maintain, [*the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs of this kind, as made ours only by Faith, upon the right of Union, as being Civiliter one perſon with* * *Chriſt*;] yet I utterly renounce their Doctrine, that make this Righteouſneſs ours, on the ground of our intereſt in the mere payment, before any Faith; as if Chriſt obeyed *in noſtrâ perſonâ*, and ſo make us *one with Chriſt before Faith*: For I could ſhew

* Though I hold it a perilous Doctrine.

ſhew, that this overthroweth the main ſubſtance of the Goſpel. I judg that God doth not for Chriſt's Righteouſneſs eſteem us to be *non peccatores*, but to be *non condemnandos*, and ſo to be *quaſi non peccatores quantum ad reatum pœnæ*.

It is therefore the *ſecond kind* of *Righteouſneſs* (*non Debitum* * *pœnæ*) which is *ours*, and which we have here to enquire after. The *relative form* of this I have ſpoke of. The *ſubject* is the *perſon* himſelf. (To ſay, that *Chriſt is righteous* for us, *if we our ſelves* be not alſo *righteous*, is no more to our comfort, than that Chriſt ſhall be *glorified for us*, when we our ſelves ſhall periſh.) The *fundamentum* of this *relation* is twofold: The firſt and immediate, which is the *efficient cauſe* of our Righteouſneſs, is without the perſon, *viz.* the *Donation* or *Conſtitution* of the Law or *Covenant*. The ſecond *ſubordinate*, *more remote*, and *leſs proper Foundation*, is in our *title* to that Donation: (I call it *Titulus* in the Law-ſenſe) (though *duo fundamenta immediata faciunt duplicem relationem*, *tamen duo fundamenta ſubordinata non item.*) Or, if you will call the *Law* or Gift only the *fundamentum* and title, and the other but the *condition*. This *Titulus* containeth in it two things conſiderable: 1. *Rationem formalem Tituli.* 2. *Rationem fundamentalem, vel cauſalem. Titulus ad beneficium ex conditione datum (præter ipſam donationem) eſt conditionis præſtatio.*

* *Jus ad impunitatem & vitam.*

By *Titulus* here I mean but that which we muſt produce of our own, to prove our ſpecial right: And not the *fundamentum juris* in full ſenſe. For that is the Deed of gift, which therefore is moſt properly our title.

præſtatio. Hic igitur ratio fundamentalis eſt duplex: 1. *Cauſa conditionis, quâ conditio eſt.* 2. *Cauſa præſtationis vel conditionis quâ præſtita. Cauſa conditionis quâ conditio eſt itidem duplex.* 1. *Remotior & quaſi materialis quæ eſt Aptitudo rei ad hoc officium.* This *Aptitude* is denominated in its reſpect to the ends of the Legiſlator: which ends are two, 1. That himſelf and Laws receive no diſhonor or wrong. 2. That the ſubject or party obliged, have a meet way to receive the benefit. Accordingly, the condition is *naturaliter apta*, 1. Which conſiſteth in the Creatures performance of its duty in perfection (as in the Old-Law;) or elſe, which ſuppoſing the wrong of the Legiſlator repaired, doth give the Repairer alſo the honor of his Grace (as Faith doth in the New-Covenant:) The former containeth a meritorious Dignity; the latter preſuppoſeth it elſewhere. 2. Which containeth a fitneſs to the aſcertaining our benefit (this is but ſubordinate, or leſs principal.) 2. *Cauſa conditionis qua talis Proxima, eſt Inſtitutio Legis vel fœderis*: This is the very *immediate fundamentum*, whence the *formalis ratio conditionis* doth reſult. It is a *Condition*, becauſe the Legiſlator or *Donor* doth conſtitute it ſuch. It is the immediate reſult of his Conſtitution, or diſcovered will.

Where note, that this Act of the Law [*Inſtituere conditionem*] is quite different from that other Act which I named a little before, viz. [*Conſtituere debitum præmii vel pœnæ.*] Both are contained in one ſentence, [*If thou obey perfectly to the end, thou ſhalt live;*] or, [*If thou believe, thou ſhalt be juſtified, and not come into condemnation, nor periſh.*] But the former part of the ſentence, [*If thou believe,*] or, [*Whoſoever believeth,*] doth inſtitute the condition:

And

And the latter part doth instiute the *debitum præmii*, and so for the *debitum pœnæ*. Also, this Institution of the *condition as a condition*, is quite different from the Instituting of the *dueneſs* of the same thing *ut officium*, as a *mere duty*: Which is done by the *Precept* as a *Precept* absolutely; and not in connexion to the *Sanction*, the performance whereof doth only institute the first sort of Righteousneſs opposite to *reatus culpæ*, which I before spoke of. So much *de fundamentali ratione conditionis quâ conditio*.

2. And then for *conditio qua præstita*, or the performance it self, which doth most immediately make it to be *Titulus secundarius*; it is the *Actus præstantis*: The interest of the party receiving the benefit, is in all this implied (else is it not *conditio præstita*.)

Here note these Propositions:

Prop. 1. The *form* of this Righteousneſs, is neither the *Law*, nor the *Title*, nor any *Habit* or *Act* which make up the *Title*; nor any *Merit* or *Satisfaction* prerequisite to the Title: But only the [*non debitum pœnæ*,] to be [*not guilty*;] *non obligatus ad pœnam*, [*non condemnandus*:] or, *Jus ad impunitatem* (*quoad pœnam damni & sensus*) *jus ad vitam æternam, per Christi justitiam promeritum & gratis* (*sub conditione receptionis congruæ*) *donatum*.

Prop. 2. *Man's own Actions* are not the *fundamentum immediatum* of his Righteousneſs: But the Constitution or tenor of the Law or Covenant is it. This will be thought strange by some perhaps, that *Adam's perfect obedience* did not *immediately* constitute him righteous, or *non reum pœnæ*; but that we should be *made righteous* by *God's Law without us*, more *properly* and *immediately*, than the *Habits* and *Acts* of holineſs within us, and performed

ed by us. But it is clear: For *Righteouſneſs* (now in queſtion) is but the *debitum præmii*, or *non debitum pœnæ*: And *debitum* is the *immediate reſult* or product of the *Law* or *Gift*, and not of our *Actions*.

But you may object, *At leaſt our Acts are the material cauſe.*

I anſwer, If by the *matter* you mean the *ſubject*, then they are not here. For here only the *perſon* is the ſubject righteous (*non obligatus ad pœnam:*) But the matter of our Title-condition they may be.

Prop. 3. In ſeveral ſenſes therefore the *Form*, the *Fundamentum* and the *Title* may be called, [*our Righteouſneſs:*] But ſo, as one be not taken for the other; 1. When we ſay, the *Form* is our *Righteouſneſs*, it is but an explicatory Propoſition *de nomine*; for otherwiſe *nihil prædicatur de ſeipſo:* The ſame thing is not the *ſubject* and *predicate*. 2. The *Goſpel-Donation* or Conſtitution *de non condemnando fideli*, may be called *our Righteouſneſs fundamentaliter*, as being the *direct efficient* thereof: As the *Law's Conſtitution de non condemnando perfectè obedienti*, was the *fundamentum* of *Adam's Righteouſneſs*. 3. But moſt commonly we give the name to the *conditio præſtita*, which is our *Title* ſecondary to Righteouſneſs. Of which in particular we muſt ſpeak more anon.

And thus I have given you my thoughts about the nature of Righteouſneſs in general, and the firſt diſtribution of it from the two parts of the Law, *Precept* and *Sanction*. Now I come to the ſecond neceſſary diſtribution of it, which is from the two *diſtinct Laws or Covenants*; which is the thing that you deny:

deny: And here I will, 1. Prove, that *there is a twofold Righteousness* necessary in respect of the *two Covenants*. 2. And shew you the *nature* of them, and the *difference* between them. 3. The necessity hence of a *twofold Justification*; and in particular, of *a Justification by Works*. 4. I shall tell you of some Learned Divines that fully hold forth this Doctrine as I do. And,

1. That here are *two distinct Righteousnesses* necessary, I shall prove now to you from these six several *Mediums*; which I think best, both for speed and strength, to lay all together. Where there are, 1. *Distinct Laws*, which our Righteousness must respect. 2. And *distinct Legislators* or *Judges*. 3. And *distinct Accusations*. 4. And *distinct Termini proximi*. 5. And *distinct Termini remotiores*. 6. And *distinct Titles*: there must needs be distinct Righteousnesses: But so it is in the present case; therefore, *&c.*

Yet one of these alone will be a sufficient proof. And, 1. If there be *distinct Laws* from whose condemnation we must be freed, and which require distinct *conditions* of that freedom, then there are *distinct Righteousnesses*: But, *&c.* therefore, *&c.*

Yet here is a great difference (of which more anon.) The *Law of Works* doth not *justifie* us, nor cease to condemn us, because Christ satisfied not *the Law properly*, but the *Lawgiver*: For the Law knows no satisfaction strictly so called; but requireth *solutionem vel officii præcepti, vel pœnæ comminatæ (si ita dicam.)* It was neither of these that Christ performed: For *Actio Noxialis sequitur caput*. But yet Christ *satisfied God as the Legislator of that Law*, and so satisfied the *ends* of the *Law*;

so

ſo that though for all this Satisfaction, the *Law* condemns us ſtill (as knowing no ſuch thing as Satisfaction; it being a *ſupra*-legal act to admit of Satisfaction which is *redditio æquivalentis, loco ipſius debiti*;) yet *Deus ut judex ſecundum hanc legem*, condemneth us not: The *condemnatio legis*, is but *condemnatio virtualis & impropria: Condemnatio enim ſtrictiſſime ſumpta, eſt ſententia.* It is therefore *condemnatio judicis* that is the full proper condemnation; and this we are freed from. Not *ne ſit*, that it be not at all; for God ſentenced man preſently on the fall in part: But, 1. *ne ſit plena & rigoroſa*; God did not *fully* then ſentence according to the ſence of the Law. 2. *Ne ſit executio vel plena, vel continuata:* So that though it be *ex poſt-facto*, when the Sentence is paſt, that Satisfaction is given, yet it is the ground of our Deliverance, and ſo that we are not *plenè & ad pœnam perpetuam condemnandi per judicem propter violationem iſtius legis.* The execution would have been full and continued, and that in rigor, if Satisfaction had not been made. Beſides, though God had paſt Sentence on man for his ſin at firſt, yet not on particular perſons for all the ſins of their lives, which are after committed againſt that *Law*: So that the *Legiſlator* will call *Satisfaction* [*Righteouſneſs*,] as attaining his Legal ends, though that *Law* it ſelf will not: And the Law it ſelf did neceſſitate it.

2. And here is a *diſtinct Legiſlator and Judg. Deus Creator* makes the *firſt Law*, requiring perfect obedience; and for want of it, beginneth Sentence and Execution, and admitteth of Satisfaction for the ſtay of it, and for our full deliverance from the incurred miſery. Upon which *Satisfaction received*, he

deny: And here I will, 1. Prove, that *there is a twofold Righteousneſs* neceſſary in reſpect of the *two Covenants*. 2. And ſhew you the *nature* of them, and the *difference* between them. 3. The neceſſity hence of a *twofold Juſtification*; and in particular, of *a Juſtification by Works*. 4. I ſhall tell you of ſome Learned Divines that fully hold forth this Doctrine as I do. And,

1. That here are *two diſtinct Righteouſneſſes* neceſſary, I ſhall prove now to you from theſe ſix ſeveral *Mediums*; which I think beſt, both for ſpeed and ſtrength, to lay all together. Where there are, 1. *Diſtinct Laws*, which our Righteouſneſs muſt reſpect. 2. And *diſtinct Legiſlators* or *Judges*. 3. And *diſtinct Accuſations*. 4. And *diſtinct Termini proximi*. 5. And *diſtinct Termini remotiores*. 6. And *diſtinct Titles*: there muſt needs be diſtinct Righteouſneſſes: But ſo it is in the preſent caſe; therefore, *&c.*

Yet one of theſe alone will be a ſufficient proof. And, 1. If there be *diſtinct Laws* from whoſe condemnation we muſt be freed, and which require diſtinct *conditions* of that freedom, then there are *diſtinct Righteouſneſſes*: But, *&c.* therefore, *&c.*

Yet here is a great difference (of which more anon.) The *Law of Works* doth not *juſtifie* us, nor ceaſe to condemn us, becauſe Chriſt ſatisfied not *the Law properly*, but the *Lawgiver*: For the Law knows no ſatisfaction ſtrictly ſo called; but requireth *ſolutionem vel officii præcepti, vel pœnæ comminatæ (ſi ita dicam.)* It was neither of theſe that Chriſt performed: For *Actio Noxialis ſequitur caput.* But yet Chriſt *ſatisfied God as the Legiſlator of that Law*, and ſo ſatisfied the *ends* of the *Law*;

ſo

so that though for all this Satisfaction, the *Law* condemns us still (as knowing no such thing as Satisfaction; it being a *supra*-legal act to admit of Satisfaction which is *redditio æquivalentis, loco ipsius debiti*;) yet *Deus ut judex secundum hanc legem*, condemneth us not: The *condemnatio legis*, is but *condemnatio virtualis & impropria: Condemnatio enim strictissime sumpta, est sententia.* It is therefore *condemnatio judicis* that is the full proper condemnation; and this we are freed from. Not *ne fit*, that it be not at all; for God sentenced man presently on the fall in part: But, 1. *ne sit plena & rigorosa*; God did not *fully* then sentence according to the sence of the Law. 2. *Ne sit executio vel plena, vel continuata:* So that though it be *ex post-facto*, when the Sentence is past, that Satisfaction is given, yet it is the ground of our Deliverance, and so that we are not *plenè & ad pœnam perpetuam condemnandi per judicem propter violationem istius legis.* The execution would have been full and continued, and that in rigor, if Satisfaction had not been made. Besides, though God had past Sentence on man for his sin at first, yet not on particular persons for all the sins of their lives, which are after committed against that *Law*: So that the *Legislator* will call *Satisfaction* [*Righteousness*,] as attaining his Legal ends, though that *Law* it self will not: And the Law it self did necessitate it.

2. And here is a *distinct Legislator and Judg. Deus Creator* makes the *first Law*, requiring perfect obedience; and for want of it, beginneth Sentence and Execution, and admitteth of Satisfaction for the stay of it, and for our full deliverance from the incurred misery. Upon which *Satisfaction received*, he

he giveth up all to the *Redeemer*, and *himself judgeth no man, but giveth all judgment to the Son:* And at the *Sons Judgment*, it will be part of our *deliverance* to be freed from the *Judgment* or *Condemnation of God as Creator.* I mean, as *Judex secundum solam legem primam:* So that though he judg not, yet that is our *freedom*; for *non judicari hoc modo*, is *non condemnari.*

John 5. 22.

3. But most plain and undeniable it is, that we are liable in Judgment to *distinct Accusations*; not only *circumstantially distinct* (for I will not distribute *à Circumstantiis*) but even as to *distinct Laws violated*, or *distinct kind of sins*, and *distinct Comminations* against us, and *distinct penalties* incurred, and distinct *conditions* unperformed (of which after.)

1. We are liable to be accused as *sinners* in general, and so as having *broken the first Law*, and thereby deserved the *penalty.* This is a *true Accusation*, and against it *directly* there is *no Justification.* But against the *annexed Accusation*, that [therefore we are *per judicem condemnandi ut obligati ad pœnam*] we must be justified, as by pleading the *Dissolution of the Obligation per legem remediantem*, as the *efficient cause*; so by pleading *Christ's Satisfaction* as the *meritorious cause*, and *quasi materia* of our Righteousness; and as being a valuable consideration for the dissolving of our obligation to punishment.

But then we are liable to a *second Accusation*; viz. *That we have no right in Christ, and the benefits of his Satisfaction:* That *we are not Believers*, and that therefore *we are guilty of that far sorer punishment.* Is not this Accusation *toto Cœlo* different from the former? If *this Accusation* be true, the sinner must be condemned for want of *title to Christ*; and

and that on two grounds, 1. Because he is left undelivered from the condemnation of the *first Law*. 2. Because he is found guilty by the tenor of the *New-Law*, both of the said *non-liberation*, and of the *additional punishment*. But if this Accusation be false, we are justified, as we next shew, by pleading *Not guilty*.

Furthermore, this *Accusation* may be threefold;

1. That we are *non-Credentes*, *not Believers* at all, but Pagans.

2. Or that we are not *sincerè Credentes*, but *Hypocrites*, and not *true Believers*.

3. Or that we were *solifidians*, and added not *sincere obedience* to our *Faith*, and that to the end. Surely against these several Accusations, we must have several ways of Justification.

4. There are also several *Termini* or *Sentences*, from which by Justification they are to be freed; that is, both from being sentenced by *God-Creator*, *as Legislator of the first Law*; and from being sentenced by Christ the *Redeemer*, *as Legislator of the New-Law*.

5. The *Termini remotiores* also are distinct: One Condemnation which we must be justified against is, that *Death* threatned *Gen.* 3. The other Condemnation that by Justification must be prevented is, a far sorer punishment.

6. And lastly, there are several *Titles* or *Pleas* against these sentences. Do you think, if Satan accuse you to be a final *Unbeliever*, or an *Hypocrite*, that it will justifie you to plead, [*Christ hath satisfied?*] Or if he say, [*Thou'art a sinner,*] is it enough to say, [*I do believe?*] No: But when he pleadeth, [*Thou hast sinned, and therefore shouldest be condemned according to the Law:*] We must plead, [*quoad*

ad Meritum; *Christ hath made Satisfaction, and the merit of that sufficeth, against the demerit of my sin*; and, *quoad legis constitutionem*, the Obligation of the first Law is dissolved by the *Grant* of the latter. [So that Christ's *Satisfaction* as to the point of *Merit*, (which is the *Aptitudo ad officium conditionis* in the first Law) is *loco conditionis à nobis præstitæ*: And so far is *our Title*. But then because it being not of our *own performance*, there must concur *our actual interest*, to make it to be *formaliter Titulus* to us; and this interest is by God conveyed by a *New-Covenant* or *Law*, and this New-Law or Grant, is again *conditional*. Hence it followeth, that we are devolved over to the New-Law, before our Justification and Deliverance from the Old is absolute and compleat: And so, though Christ's Satisfaction be compleat, and *perfecta satisfactio*, and nothing be wanting *quoad meritum*; yet it is but *Titulus aptitudinalis*, *vel conditionalis*; wanting nothing in it self, but something to *appropriate* it *to us* to apply it, and give us interest: And that is, 1. On God's part, his Grant or Promise. 2. On our part, the performance of the Condition of this New-Law or Promise. So that as to our Deliverance or Justification from the Condemnation of the first *Law*, we have a threefold Title necessary to plead; or a Title thus divided: 1. *Quoad Meritum*, *Christ's Satisfaction* is our *only Title*. 2. *Quoad Appropriationem vel Applicationem*: 1. God's gift, in Christ's Testament. 2. Our performing the Conditions (though the last be most imperfectly called Title.) As if *Adam* had perfectly obeyed, there

If any had rather call Faith *Conditio Tituli*, than *ipse Titulus*, I do not dislike it, but think it the propereſt ſpeech.

there would have been in his Obedience: 1. The *meritorious Value.* 2. The *perſonal Intereſt.* So now *Chriſt's Satisfaction* is imputed to us for Righteouſneſs, as to the *Merit and Value.* But the *New-Covenant* giveth the *perſonal Intereſt:* And becauſe it gives it but *conditionally*, therefore *our performance* is of neceſſity to our *perſonal Intereſt* as the Condition.

But then here being a *New-Law* (*Lex remedians*) made for this *Conveyance*, here is occaſion of a *New-Accuſation*, *New-Plea*, and ſo a *New-Righteouſneſs* and *Juſtification:* So that here is *nova cauſa*, and therefore muſt needs be *nova juſtitia & juſtificatio.* The Queſtion was in the *firſt cauſe*, [*Whether the Priſoner or accuſed be* condemnandus *as a ſinner, for breaking the Law of Works?*] *Quoad meritum*, it is preſently determined for all: *Chriſt's Satisfaction* was *ſufficiens pretium.* But the caſe cannot be fully decided by that, for then the *perſonal Intereſt* is queſtioned: Whereupon the cauſe is devolved to the *New-Law*, and the performance of its Condition. And there comes in the *ſecond cauſe:* [*Whether the Defendant have performed the Condition of the New-Law or Covenant?*] And here the Condition hath not *ad aptitudinem*, *rationem Meriti:* Here he muſt be juſtified by producing his Faith in the Redeemer, which is the Condition: Which is the *quaſi-materia* of that his Righteouſneſs, and ſo his neareſt Title to Juſtification. For if he be accuſed of *final Unbelief or Rebellion*, he muſt plead [*Not guilty.*] And here *his Acts* muſt *firſt* be juſtified, before *he* can be juſtified: Not that they muſt be juſtified *againſt every Charge* that can be brought againſt them, or as not being *ſinful*, or as being a Conformity to the

Law of Works, or yet fully to the mere preceptive part of the New-Law: But as being the true *performance* of the *Condition of the New-Law*; which is the thing to be made good, when the Accusation is, that we have not performed that Condition.

Note, That where I said before, that this sort of Justification [*to be non-obligatus ad pœnam*] belongeth immediately to the man as the only subject, and not first to his actions: Yet I deny not, but his actions may be the conditional ground of it, as evil actions are the meritorious cause of guilt; only it is improper to say, that the *action* is *guilty*, or *obligatus ad pœnam*.

For indeed it is another sort of *justitia*, another relation, which we are now speaking of, distinct from [*non reus pœnæ:*] I did not mention it before as a third sort of Righteousness constituted by the Law: 1. Because it is only conditional Laws that constitute it: And, 2. Not all those neither, because sometime a Condition may not be *actio potestativa vel arbitraria*; but it may be either something casual, or some action or thing that is in anothers power. 3. And it is but *subordinate*, or a means to the last sort of Righteousness [*non reatus pœnæ:*] But yet indeed where Laws are (in their *Sanction*) conditional, they cause a threefold guilt, or a threefold Righteousness: 1. *Reatus culpæ qua talis* (by the *Precept:*) And so a *Righteousness* which is *non Reatus culpæ*. 2. *Reatus non præstitæ conditionis, quâ talis* (by the act of Law which constituteth the *Condition:*) And so a *Righteousness* which consisteth in *performing the Condition*. 3. *Reatus pœnæ propter non præstitam conditionem* (by the act of the Law instituting *Pœnam:*) And so a Righteousness contrary.

trary. Now the laſt of theſe is only on the *perſon for the action*, and not *on the action*. But the two firſt, are both firſt on the *action*, and then on the *perſon*: Becauſe *Adam*'s *actions* were *conform* to the *Precept*, and ſo *juſt*; therefore *Adam* was reputed *conform* to the *Precept*, and ſo *juſt*. Becauſe *Paul* did perform the *Conditions* of the New-Covenant, his *action* of *Faith* and ſincere Obedience was conform to that Covenant, ſo far as it inſtituted the Condition; and in that ſenſe *juſt*: And if any had accuſed *Paul*'s actions as being *no true performance* of the *Condition* of the New-Law or Teſtament, *they* might firſt be juſtified from their own Juſtice, and then *he* conſequently be in that point juſt by reſult therefrom, becauſe the *actions* were his own, and ſo juſtified thereby againſt the Accuſation of *non*-performance.

And this is it that we uſe to call the *quaſi-materia* of our Righteouſneſs, *viz.* that which is the *ſubjectum primum* of it, from whence it reſulteth on our ſelves as the *ſubjectum ultimatum*, and there reſteth. The *perfect Obedience* of *Adam* in Innocency, was the *ſubjectum primum juſtitiæ*, from whence it flowed to *Adam*'s perſon as the ultimate principal ſubject. In reference to the mere Law of Works, we have *no Righteouſneſs ſtrictly* ſo called: But as to the *Legiſlator* of that Law, and the *ſententia judicis*, we have a *Righteouſneſs*; and the *ſubjectum primum* of that is, *Chriſt's Satisfaction* without us, which was equivalent to our Obedience or Puniſhment. And therefore we uſe to call Chriſt's Satisfaction, both the *meritorious cauſe*, and the *matter* of our Legal-Righteouſneſs. So when the caſe is, *Whether we are true performers of the Goſpel-condition?* there our

Performance it ſelf muſt firſt be *juſt* (in that) and *juſtified* as the *ſubjectum primum* of our Righteouſneſs: And thence we our ſelves muſt by reſult be juſt, and ſo be juſtified by that as the *quaſi-materia* of that Righteouſneſs. So that the ſame Faith, which in our firſt cauſe is but *Titulus ad juſtitiam Chriſti ſanguine acquiſitam* (or rather only *conditio Tituli*;) is afterwards in the *ſecond* cauſe, our *ipſa juſtitia*: For when it is *ipſe Titulus* that is queſtioned, and ſo made the ſubject of the cauſe, then the *firmneſs* or *ſolidity* of that *Title* is alſo the *ipſa juſtitia*. For it is the *juſtitia cauſæ*, and conſequently muſt be *materially* the *juſtitia Perſonæ*: I ſay not his *Righteouſneſs univerſal*, and in *all reſpects*; but his Righteouſneſs *ſo far*, and *as to that cauſe*. Thus I have ſhewed you the neceſſity of a twofold Righteouſneſs: The proofs from particular Texts of Scripture, are already in the Aphoriſms, and more ſhall be ſaid of it anon, if I find a call to it.

2. Now for the *nature* and difference of theſe Righteouſneſſes, though it be fully expreſſed in what is ſaid already, yet I ſhall add theſe Differences more particularly, wherein the nature will be clearlier underſtood.

1. One Righteouſneſs conſiſteth in [*our non-obligation to puniſhment by the Law of Works, notwithſtanding our ſinning againſt it*;] becauſe that *Obligation* is *diſſolved* upon Satisfaction made by Chriſt. The *other* Righteouſneſs conſiſteth in, [*our non-obligation to the far greater puniſhment, and alſo to the non-liberation from former miſery*, which are threatned by the New-Covenant.] This firſt difference is, from the different Laws or Covenants, which have different Conditions; and the fulfilling of the Condition

Condition of each Covenant or Law, is that which is by that Covenant called the *matter* of our Righteouſneſs; as that from whence the Immunity from the Penalty doth reſult.

2. Herein I expreſs the ſecond difference, that it is from ſeveral puniſhments that we are freed from. And therefore it is not the ſame Righteouſneſs to be *non reus hujus pœnæ*, and to be *non reus alterius pœnæ*.

If you ſay as ſome do, that the New-Law hath no proper penalty of its own.

I anſwer. 1. It is not ſo: For even already you acknowledge, that it hath a penalty *gradually* differing: And the extremeſt pain of the Stone is ſo gradually different from the leaſt pain of that kind, that it may conſtitute a ſpecifick difference in ſome ſenſe.

Object. *But there are pains gradually different, due by the ſame Law.*

Anſwer. But when it is due by a *diſtinct Law*, on *diſtinct terms*, there is requiſite a *diſtinct Plea* for Abſolution. 2. *Non-liberation* is the penalty threatned by the New-Law. He that believeth not, ſhall not be delivered from the Curſe of the firſt Law. Here the *ſame* penalty *materially*, is the penalty of two diſtinct Laws, and *formally* two diſtinct penalties, *viz.* of the firſt Law, as a penalty firſt due by it; and of the New-Law, as it is a *non-liberation* threatned by it.

Object. *This penalty we ſhould have been liable to, had there been no New-Covenant.*

Anſw. Not *formaliter*: For it would have been but a Privation of the good of the firſt Covenant, but not a *Privation* (but mere Negation) of the

Liberation purchased and *offered*, which is the good of the New-Covenant. For it cannot be a *Privation*, till there be some *hope* or *means* of our enjoying it: And therefore to the Devils, the loss of God is *Privatio*; but their *non-liberation* from that misery and loss is no *Privation*: For they never had means or hopes to attain such a Liberation; *e. g.* If a hundred men lye in Prison for Murther, and fifty of them be put death without remedy: These die on the Law against Murther. But if the Parliament to the other fifty make a pardoning Act of Grace, saying, [All that will thankfully accept it, and come out of Prison, shall be pardoned, and the rest shall die by double Torments:] Here now the additional Torment is for their ungrateful refusal of pardon, not for the first fault; and the first deserved death is for both: As it is *such a death*, it is the penalty of the Law against Murther; but as it is a death inflicted after the offer of pardon (which did, as it were, conditionally give a new-life) so it is the penalty of the Law of Grace, which penalty hath in it more than the former; the loss or Privation of a *New-life*, and the *non-liberation* from the formerly-adjudged death. Thus it is in our present case so plainly, that I need not apply it.

3. A third Difference is this:. Our first Righteousness is without us, in the *Merit and Satisfaction* of another, Jesus Christ; and in his free gift by Covenant. But our *second Righteousness* is *within us*, and by us: For the New-Lawgiver will not admit of a *Mediator* to *believe, and repent, and obey Christ for us*; nor of *Satisfaction* for our *final Impenitency, Rebellion* or *Unbelief*.

4. Dif-

4. Difference: The firſt Righteouſneſs is by Divines ſaid to be the ſame thing with *Remiſſion of ſin*; and in ſubſtance it is ſo. The *ſecond Righteouſneſs* is ſo far from it, that (as to the point in queſtion) it conſiſteth in *Innocency*, or *Not-guiltineſs*, that is, of the *non-performance* of the *Condition* of the New-Covenant.

5. The *firſt* Righteouſneſs is oppoſite to that guilt which ſin in general procureth. The ſecond is oppoſite only to that guilt which is procured by *one kind of ſin* in *ſpecial*, *viz.* Rejecting finally the Lord that bought us.

6. The *firſt* Righteouſneſs, as it is materially in Chriſt's Satisfaction, is not the *Idem* which the Law required, but the *Tantundem*. The ſecond is the *ſame* which is required by the *New-Law*, as its *Condition*.

7. The *firſt* Righteouſneſs, as it is materially in Chriſt's Satisfaction, is not ſo denominated by the Law it ſelf (which required the *Idem*, and not the *Tantundem*, *aut obedientiam aut pœnam delinquentis*, *& non pœnam innocentis*; but by the *Legiſlator* who is above Law. The ſecond Righteouſneſs is a Conformity to the Law of Grace it ſelf, as it requireth it as a Condition.

8. The firſt Righteouſneſs is, that we may be juſtified *à condemnatione Legis*, by *diſſolving* its Obligation already contracted. The ſecond is, that we may *prevent condemnationem Legis novæ*, and may *not contract* the guilt.

9. The *firſt* Righteouſneſs ſeemeth to juſtifie us againſt a *true Accuſation*, [*That we by ſin deſerved death.*] The ſecond ſerveth to juſtifie us only againſt a *falſe Accuſation*, [*That we have not performed*

performed the Condition of the New-Covenant, that is, that we have finally rejected Christ.

10. The Righteousness of the first Covenant, as required by the Covenant, lyeth in so full *Perfection of duty*, that the performance is honorable to the Creature, and would have made the reward to be of *Debt*: And as it is in Christ's Satisfaction, it is accordingly yet *more* honorable to the *Satisfier*. But the *second* Righteousness (the performance of the Condition of the New-Covenant) is purposely designed to another use, to be the sinners *self-denying* acknowledgment of his sin and misery, and insufficiency to deliver himself, and so to put all the honor from himself of his recovery, and to honor the Free-Grace of the Redeemer. So that it is not *Merit* that is its *Aptitudo ad officium conditionis*, but the glorifying of him that hath merited for us.

11. The matter of the first Righteousness is inconsistent with sin in the Performer; because the *Precept* and the *Condition* are of *equal extent*: The *perfect obeying* of the Precept, is the *Condition*. But the Righteousness of the *second* Law, may, and doth consist with *sin* against the *Precept* of that same *Law*, because the *Condition* is not of so large extent as the *Duty commanded*. Christ *commandeth* us much more than he hath directly made the *Conditions* of his Covenant. Indeed *sincere Obedience* to him is part of his Condition; and so the Precept of perfect duty, is the Rule according to which sincere Obedience doth labour to square its actions: And so the *particular duties* may be said *materially* to *belong to the Condition*: But it is but *remotely*, so far as they are necessarily the matter of *sincere Obedience*. For many a duty may be omitted, and yet Obedience be sincere.

12. Chiefly

12. Chiefly obſerve, that the firſt Righteouſneſs is a *juſtitia univerſalis*, where it is performed by the perſon himſelf: And it is *univerſalis exceptâ vel ſalvâ conditionis neceſſitate*, when it is performed by *another* (*by Chriſt*) and ſo given us. But the *ſecond Righteouſneſs*, conſiſting in our performance of the New-Covenants Condition, is but *juſtitia particularis vel ſecundum quid*, as to *this particular cauſe*. I ſay, that the firſt had been *juſtitia univerſalis*, if performed by our ſelves (*vel naturaliter vel civiliter ut per delegatum noſtrum:*) For then we had been *abſolutely and perfectly innocent*. But being performed by *another* (*æquivalenter in Satisfactione*) and one that was not our Delegate, but a free Undertaker, therefore it was none of ours upon the mere performance; and therefore the Performer and the Accepter did themſelves chooſe on what terms it ſhould be applied to us, or be made ours *quoad fructus:* And the terms reſolved on were the New-Covenants Conditions, which are now required of us to our participation hereof. So that now Chriſt's Satisfaction is not *ſimpliciter* our *univerſal Righteouſneſs*; for then there were no need of any other of any ſort, to any end, no not the Inherent Righteouſneſs, as commonly acknowledged. But it is our *univerſal Righteouſneſs*, except only as to performance of the Condition of its Application: For Chriſt never died for the *final non-performance* of this: And where it is performed (as it is by all that are ſacred) he need no more to die for their *non-performance*, than for any nomnial, or falſly-charged ſin, which is no ſin, but a duty. In all conditional Grants, the Condition is excepted from the Grant. *Quod eſt in conditione non eſt in obligatione.*

Fur-

Further, where I call the second, [*a particular Righteousness,*] understand, that there is a *twofold particular Righteousness*, according to the cause. One when the cause is of small moment to the plenary Justification and Liberation of the accused: So any Reprobate, or the Devil himself, may be falsly accused, and may be righteous as to the matter that he is accused of (as *Bradshaw* truly observes.) But the other is, when the cause is of so great moment, that the Justification or Condemnation, the Life or Death of the party depends upon it, as being the very Condition of that Act of Grace, or remedying Law which all our hope is in, and by which we must be judged: This is our last.

And here I must either explain or reverse my speech in *Aphoris.* p. 203. [*Because there is no danger to us from false Accusation before the All-knowing God, therefore Scripture saith nothing of any such Justification.*] Indeed we are in no danger of this or any Accusation (those that are in Christ:) But it is evident in *Matth.* 25. and all other descriptions of the Judgment-process, that the main point that will be in question and tryal will be, *Whether we were true Believers or Performers of the Condition of the Covenant of Grace, or not?* and so, *Whether we have that personal Inherent Righteousness, which is the Condition of our interest in Christ and his benefits.* And therefore the *Accuser* hath no hope in any other Plea against any man, but that he is an *Unbeliever*, or Rejecter of recovering mercy. He is not so ignorant of Scripture, as to think to prevail for mens Condemnation, merely because they are *sinners*, when he knows they will plead, that *Christ hath satisfied.* But he will labour to

prove,

prove, that *Christ's Satisfaction* shall *not absolve* them, because they have *no right in him*, as having *not performed his Conditions* for participation. On this the sinner must stand or fall, and the final Sentence pass.

13. The last Difference also especially to be noted is, That the *first Righteousness* is *necessary* primarily, as being the Creatures *Perfection* justly required by the holy sin-hating Creator. But the second Righteousness (personal) is required *propter aliud*, in subordination to the first, as a means to its end: And so stands in no opposition to it, nor doth it argue it of any imperfection; no more than the necessity of a means doth signifie any imperfection in the end. The whole reason and nature of Merit lyeth in the first Righteousness: But because it was not of our performance, and because the Redeemer never intended to make us lawless or masterless, therefore a New-Covenant or Law was requisite both for application, donation, or conveyance of *Christ's Righteousness* to us; and also to prescribe us our *duty* which should be necessary thereto: And so comes in the necessity of the 2d Righteousness, subordinate to the first.

Thus I have shewed you the differences of these two Righteousnesses. And though some of them are indeed the same in sense with others, yet if the variety of Notions do but conduce to the clearer Explication of the real differences, I have my end. The difference of the two Laws or Covenants, is the main ground which shews the necessity of this twofold Righteousness.

3. I should next hence shew you the necessity of a twofold *Justification*. But it is so evident from what is said, that I will add but this much: If there be a twofold *Covenant*, with distinct *Conditions*, and

and a twofold *Accuſation*, *viz.* for not-performing the one or the other, then there muſt needs be a two-fold *Juſtification*: But *&c. ergo*, &c. To be *accuſed as a ſinner*, that is, [one that *did not continue in all things written in the Law to do them*,] is not the ſame as to be *accuſed* to be [*an Unbeliever or Rejecter of Chriſt*, or one that would not have him reign over us, or one that neglected ſo great Salvation, and improved not the Talents of the Redeemer's Mercies, or obeyed not the Goſpel, or trod under foot the blood of the Covenant, *&c.*] Muſt you not be juſtified againſt the former Accuſation by *Chriſt's blood directly?* and againſt the latter by your *own Innocency?* Will it ſerve to juſtifie any man, when Satan accuſeth him of *final Unbelief* or *Impenitency*, to plead *Chriſt's Satisfaction?* Methinks this caſe is ſo plain, that I muſt deſire your pardon that I have uſed ſo many words about it.

4. Becauſe I come newly from tranſcribing a multitude of Authors that deliver the ſame Doctrine as I do, I will now recite the words but of a few (for this is but an Argument againſt prejudice.) 1. Judicious *Placæus* in *Theſ. Salmurienſ. Vol.* 1. *de Juſtif. p.* 32, 34. §. 37. §. 41. ' *Idipſum fortaſſe hoc ratione commodius explicabitur. Opponitur Juſtificatio Accuſationi. A duabus autem Accuſationibus premimur in foro divino.* 1. *Objicitur nos eſſe peccatores: hoc eſt* [*Reos violatæ conditionis quæ fœdere Legali lata eſt.*] *Deinde objicitur nos eſſe infideles: hoc eſt* [*non præſtitiſſe conditionem fœderis gratiæ,*] *viz. Fidem. Ab Accuſatione priore ſola fide Juſtificamur; qua Chriſti gratiam & juſtitiam amplectimur. A poſteriore Juſtificamur etiam operibus quatenus in fides oſtenditur. Ad poſteriorem Accuſationem reſpicien-*

'ficiens Jacobus *affirmavit meritò, ex operibus juſtificari hominem, & non ex fide tantum*; Paulus *vero reſpiciens ad priorem, ſola fide hominem juſtificari*, 'ꝛc.

§. 42. 'In die judicii quoniam fœdus gratiæ vim 'Legis ſeu juris obtinet (promulgatum eſt enim in toto 'orbe terrarum per præcones Idoneos.) Id unum pro- 'bandum erit, nimirum, nos habuiſſe conditionem fœ- 'deris gratiæ, ſcil. Fidem. Itaq; proferenda erunt 'in medium opera, præſertim charitatis, tanquam il- 'lius conditionis, hoc eſt fidei effecta atq; argumenta 'demonſtrativa, ut vulgò loquuntur, à poſteriori. Vid. 'Theſin proximam.

2. Ludovicus de Dieu in Jac. 2.24. 'Facile hic 'locus conciliatur cum iis quæ Paulus paſſim contra vi- 'detur diſputare, ſi ſtatuamus quod eſt veriſſimum, '1. Apoſtolum Jacobum *non agere hic de una ſolâ Ju- ſtificatione quæ partim fide, partim operibus perage- tur, ſed de duabus diſtinctis, quarum prior eſt ex fide, & fide tantum, altera ex operibus eſt. Quum enim duplex inſtituatur accuſatio in fideles, una à* 'Deo, Lege & Conſcientia à quibus verè peccatores rei 'aguntur, altera à Diabolo & improbis, à quibus falsò 'hypocriſeos, mercenarii animi, impietatis ac nefari- 'orum rei perhibentur, duplex requiritur Juſtificatio; 'una quâ in ſe verè peccatores abſolvuntur gratuitò 'propter Chriſtum à Reatu ſuorum peccatorum, quæ 'Juſtificatio à ſola fide eſt ſine operibus. Altera, quâ 'ut vere ſanctificati & regeniti, abſolvuntur à falſis 'illis Diaboli & improborum criminationibus. Quæ 'juſtificatio petitur ex operibus. Jacobus urget, utramq; eſſe conjungendam adeoq; non juſtificari ho- minem ex fide tantum, ſed & ex operibus. Id eſt, 'non ſufficere ut juſtificetur ex fide à peccatis quæ

'com-

'*commisit, sed requiri porrò ut justificetur etiam ex* '*operibus à peccatis quorum falsò Accusatur & à* '*quibus per Regenerationem immunis est.*

'*Vide hujus rei pleniorem explicationem in notis ejus-* '*dem, in* Rom. 8. 4.

3. The same is fully asserted by *Wotton de Reconcil.* p. 1. l. 2. c. 18. and p. 2. l. 2. c. 35. p. 383. n. 7. and p. 2. l. 1. c. 7. p. 144. and Part. 2. l. 1. c. 5. p. 127. §. 3, 4. and c. 6. p. 138. n. 2. (I must content my self to refer you to the places, to save the labour of transcribing.)

1. *Bradshaw* de Justific. Lat. cap. 24. §. 21, 23, 25, 26. where he tells you of a twofold Righteousness, and that, '*Per justitiam Christi nobis imputa-* '*tam non possimus dici absolutè sive omi modo justi ac si* '*propter eam eo loco nos Deus haberet, ac si omnia ex* '*Lege sua à nobis requisita præstitissemus. Tum* '*enim post admissam & acceptam Christi justitiam il-* '*lam, nullam à nobis Deus obedientiam Legi suæ ex* '*parte nostra præstandam exigere posset. Sed per ju-* '*stitiam Christi nobis imputatam eatenus nos justos* '*facios æstimat Deus, quatenus Legis divinæ trans-* '*gressores exstiterimus. Ut in tantum ex illa Christi* '*justitia justi facti dicamur, in quantum ex inobe-* '*dientia nostra injusti constituti simus. Neq; enim* '*pro eis omnibus satisfecit Christus quæ ex Lege facere* '*tenebamur (huc enim qui Legem dissolveret in mun-* '*dum venisset:) sed pro eis tantum quæ vel contra Le-* '*gem feceramus, vel cum facere deberemus non fecera-* '*mus.* Et cap. 25. '*Cui peccati particularis &c. Vide* '*ultra.*

I confess in all this, things are not spoken so orderly as I could wish them, but the point in question is fully asserted. So *Deodate* in divers places.

And

And *Teſtardus* moſt fully *de Natur. & Grat. Synopſ. pag.* 164. Many more might be alledged, but theſe may ſuffice to my ends.

Thus much for the Explication and Confirmation of my Aſſertion. Now to your words: Your Reaſon why this Doctrine is not founded on Scripture is, because,[' That ſhews us that Chriſt's Satisfaction 'merely is the Righteouſneſs whereby we are ju-'ſtified, though faith be required on our part, that 'it may be imputed to us as ours, *&c.* Faith is the 'Condition by which we are made partakers of that 'Righteouſneſs, *viz.* Chriſt's Satisfaction: And in 'that reſpect we are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith, '*Rom.* 5. 1. with *Acts* 13. 39. But that Faith is a 'diſtinct Righteouſneſs, by which, together with 'Chriſt's Satisfaction, we muſt be juſtified, ſeems 'to be as if we ſhould make the Medicine and ap-'plying of it two things co-ordinate each with 'other, when-as one is but ſubordinate and ſubſer-'vient, *&c.*

Reply. 1. You ſay as much as I in ſenſe; but only deny the term [*Righteouſneſs*] to Faith, while you yield the *thing*.

2. Your Aſſertion, That it's without Scripture, is but a *Petitio principii*, and your proof none at all. You ſhall ſee the contrary fully anon, and did ſee Scripture enough cited in the *Aphoriſm*.

3. *Quoad meritum & materiam juſtitiæ primæ fœderis*, Chriſt's Satisfaction is ſolely and wholly our Righteouſneſs, and not our Faith.

4. If Faith be the Condition conſtituted by a New-Law or Covenant, by which we are to be judged to life or death, then the performance of

that Condition is the thing materially by which that ſame Covenant will judg us righteous, *non reos pœnæ illius Legis*: And ſo when the Queſtion is, Whether we have performed that Condition or no? the actual performance is our Righteouſneſs as to that cauſe. Let any unprejudiced man judg, whether this be not clear truth.

5. You confeſs, that more than Faith is in the Condition: Repentance, Love, &c. And *James* ſaith, *We are juſtified by Works*; and Chriſt, *by our Words*: Therefore it is not true, that [*this is not Scripture-Doctrine and Language*;] nor that it is *improper* to ſay, we are thus juſtified. And alſo this is no Phyſical Application.

6. If it were *improper* to ſay, *We are healed by the Medicine, and by the Application*: 1. Then common ſpeech deceives us. 2. Rules of Logick deceive us. 3. Scripture ſhould ſpeak improperly in ſaying, We are juſtified by Faith and Works, and not only by Chriſt's Satisfaction. 7. The Application of a Medicine hath its intereſt in the Cure, *ex neceſſitate & aptitudine naturali* immediately: But Faith, Repentance and ſincere Obedience, have their intereſt in our Juſtification; but remotely *ex naturali aptitudine*, and immediately *proximè, ex Conſtitutione Divina*, and in their *Moral* reſpect. And therefore your example from a *Phyſical* caſe to an *Ethical* or *Political*, will little hold or illuſtrate.

8. But you do very ſtrangely ſeem to overlook the frequently-inculcated paſſages of my Book, and ſo to miſtake and overlook my meaning in that very point, wherein I moſt fully expreſs it, when you ſpeak of [*a diſtinct Righteouſneſs, together with Chriſt's Satisfaction*, &c. *as two things co-ordinate, which*

which partly one, partly the other juſtifie, when one is ſubordinate, &c.] What have I ſaid ſo frequently and fully, as that *Faith* is *no part* of our *Legal Righteouſneſs?* That it is not joyned with Chriſt's Satisfaction to make up our Righteouſneſs? nor is one grain of it? nor hath any Merit in it? or is accepted for its value? &c. I fully profeſs that they are *not co-ordinate*; but that the very *New-Law* or *Covenant* is but *ſubordinate* to the *Old*; and conſequently the *Righteouſneſs* required by it, is but *ſubordinate* and *ſubſervient* to the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt's Satisfaction for our ſins againſt the Law; and that it is the *Condition* of enjoying it: And therefore *our Righteouſneſs ſo far, becauſe a Condition inſtituted by a New-Law.* It is injurious therefore to talk of *Co-ordination* as my ſenſe, who ſo conſtantly profeſs the one to be *ſubſervient*, *& propter aliud*, as your Application of the Medicine is. And I little doubt, but it is proper to ſay, He that hath the Medicine, and will not apply it, dies for want of Application; and he that doth apply it, recovers in one reſpect, through the Medicine; in another, becauſe he applied it. I think we are agreed, how much of the praiſe belongs to the Medicine, and how much to the Application: And then for the *term* [*Righteouſneſs*,] we ſhall ſee what the Scripture ſaith of it anon, when your Exceptions more neceſſarily lead me to it.

Aphoriſm.

Page 108. *OUr Evangelical Righteouſneſs is not without us in Chriſt, as our pro-legal Righteouſneſs is; but conſiſteth in our own actions of Faith and Goſpel-Obedience.*

Animadverſ.

That Righteouſneſs which the Goſpel doth not hold unto us, is our Evangelical Righteouſneſs, and that is a Righteouſneſs without us in Chriſt. It is Chriſt's Righteouſneſs which is imputed to us, and made ours to Juſtification. Chriſt's Satisfaction may be called both our Evangelical Righteouſneſs, as being revealed and offered in the Goſpel, *Rom.* 1. 16, 17. and alſo [our Legal Righteouſneſs,] as being that which the Law requireth, and whereby it is ſatisfied, *Chriſt being the end of the Law for Righteouſneſs to every one that believeth*, Rom. 10. 4. But otherwiſe the Scripture excludes Legal Righteouſneſs, and ſets up Evangelical Righteouſneſs, as that by which we muſt be juſtified, *Rom.* 10. 5, &c. *Phil.* 3. 9.

Reply.

You ſpeak my own words; yea, ſpeak more for Legal Righteouſneſs than I will. For I do not think, that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs of Satisfaction, is that which the Law required (for it required *ſupplicium delinquentis, & non Mediatoris*;) nor yet that the Law was ſatisfied ſtrictly by it (except *quoad finem remotum*: For it is an Act of the *Rector* *above Laws*, to admit *Satisfaction*, which is *reddi-tio æquivalentis*; and it ſuppoſeth a *Relaxation* of the Law, and the Law cannot relax it ſelf:) And yet you ſeem to oppoſe me for ſpeaking of a *Legal Righteouſneſs*. In what reſpect I call'd Chriſt's Satisfaction a [Legal Righteouſneſs] I told you fully; even the ſame in ſenſe, as you allow here.

Aphoriſm.

Page 110. *THe Righteouſneſs of the New-Covenant, beeing the performance of its Conditions*, &c.

Animadverſ.

This ſeems to be the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, the main thing wherein you miſtake. I ſhould diſtinguiſh betwixt the Righteouſ-

neſs

nes of the New-Covenant, and the *Condition* required of us that we may partake of it. The Righteousnes of the first Covenant is personal Righteousnes performed by us, *Rom.* 10. 5. The Righteousnes of the New-Covenant, is the Righteousnes of Christ imputed to us; but not except we believe in him, *Acts* 13. 39. I speak (as you do) of such Righteousnes as whereby we are justified.

Reply.

1. Can you give any tolerable Reason, why I may not (at least) as fitly denominate *Righteousnes* from the several Covenants prescribing it, and to which it is conform, that is, from the most *immediate Foundation*; as you may denominate it from the *mere Offer or Discovery* in the Gospel to be *Evangelical* (that is, *ab accidente*) when you confes it is *Legal* in my sense (and more?) And yet this *tota lis est de nomine.*

If you say, Why do not I lay down *litem de nomine*, by speaking as others?

I answer, 1. Because Scripture speaks so before me. 2. It is necessary to the right unfolding the main Doctrine. 3. The Scripture-phrase is become so odious, and so great breaches are made in the Church, by deepest censuring those that use it, that it is necessary to reassume it, and vindicate it. 4. It tends most potently to heal our breaches, *&c.* By the way here bear witnes, that where you give as much to Faith as I (to be the Condition) and so the *tota lis est de nomine justitiæ*, yet you say, this seems to be the πρῶτον ψεῦδος: So that my πρῶτον ψεῦδος is of no higher a nature than *de nomine*, if it be an error, as you deem.

2. But why speak you nothing to discover this Master-falshood? yea, when I laid so plain a ground for it, which you deny not, *viz.* from the very de-

ſcription of Righteouſneſs, of one ſort, and in the moſt uſual ſenſe? But I think I have ſaid enough before to vindicate it.

Aphoriſm.

Page 111. *TO affirm, That our Evangelical, or New-Covenant Righteouſneſs is in Chriſt, and not in our ſelves, &c. 1. It implieth blaſphemy againſt Chriſt, as if he had ſin to repent of, pardon to accept, &c.*

Animadverſ.

All this follows, if Faith be *our Evangelical Righteouſneſs*: Not if it be (as it is) our Condition to be partakers of that Righteouſneſs. That Righteouſneſs is to be ſought by Faith, therefore it is called, [Righteouſneſs which is of Faith,] *Rom.* 10. 6. Righteouſneſs by faith, *Gal.* 5. 5. The Righteouſneſs of God which is by Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, *viz.* as the object of faith, not as the ſubject, *Rom.* 3. 22.

Reply.

You confeſs all that I ſay *de re*, but deny it *de nomine Juſtitiæ*. You confeſs, that all this Blaſphemy follows, if we ſay, [*Chriſt repented and believed for us.* 2. For the name of [*Righteouſneſs,*] the Texts you mention deny it not to Faith. It followeth not that the Condition of the New-Covenant is not Righteouſneſs, becauſe it is a Condition or means of our partaking of a further Righteouſneſs. Yet this is all your arguing from the Scriptures cited; or elſe becauſe [Chriſt's Satisfaction is our Righteouſneſs, therefore there is no other ſubſervient Righteouſneſs] which is as weak.

Aphoriſm.

Page 118. *IN this fore-explained ſenſe it is, that men are ſaid to be perſonally righteous.*

Anim.

Animadver.

In the Scripture men are ſaid to be perſonally righteous diverſ ways: 1. Comparatively, as being leſs unrighteous, *Gen.* 38. 26. 2. In ſome particular caſe, *Pſal.* 7.8. & 18.20. 3. In reſpect of ſtudy and endeavour to conform to the Will of God in all things, *Luke* 1.6. But that any are ſo perſonally righteous, as that by their own perſonal righteouſneſs they are ſimply and abſolutely juſtified in the ſight of God, this the Scripture doth not teach us, but is againſt it, *Pſal.* 130.3,4. & 143. 2.

Reply.

1. Nor did ever I teach it: And yet one would think you intimate that I did. [*Simply and Abſolutely*] are great words. I do not think that *Chriſt's Satisfaction* doth juſtifie us *ſimply and abſolutely*: For then how can *Faith* be the Condition? It juſtifies no man for *non*-performance of the Condition finally: And he that *doth perform* it, needs no Juſtification for his *non*-performance; and therefore Chriſt's Satisfaction is not *ſo far* his Righteouſneſs, and ſo not *ſimply* and *abſolutely* his Righteouſneſs. This is true, both of our Repentance, Faith, and ſincere Obedience. Much leſs durſt I ever think that our Faith is ſimply and abſolutely our Righteouſneſs, if thereby you mean as you ſeem to do, our *univerſal Righteouſneſs materially*.

2. The comparative Righteouſneſs which you mention, is *indeed no Righteouſneſs*. And if you would make uſe of tropical terms, you might perhaps have found Unrighteouſneſs it ſelf, ſomewhere called Righteouſneſs Ironically: Shall we therefore in Diſpute ſay, Unrighteouſneſs is Righteouſneſs?

3. But your two laſt Conceſſions deſtroy your Cauſe: For both together make up the Righteouſneſs of Faith which you deny. For, 1. It is

justitia causæ particularis, and not *universalis*; but then remember the distinction of *justitia particularis*, which I gave you before. It is such a *justitia particularis*, as our Salvation or Damnation will be determined by at Judgment. 2. And the matter of this *justitia particularis*, is sincere Obedience added to Faith; which Obedience consisteth in that endeavour to conform to God's Will, which you express.

Aphorism.

Page 120. *BUt if you consider our actions and persons in relation to the Rule of the New-Covenant, so all the Regenerate are personally righteous*, &c.

Animadvers.

But this personal Righteousness (I say still) is not that whereby we are justified, but that whereby we are sanctified; being indeed one and the same with Holiness: And therefore Righteousness and Holiness, or righteous and holy, are divers times in Scripture joyned together, as terms equivalent one to the other: Though in some respect they may be distinguished, *Luke* 1. 75. *Ephes.* 4. 24. *Psal.* 145. 17. *Rev.* 22. 11.

Reply.

1. I thought all this while you had denied the name of [*Righteousness*] to belong to it: But now I perceive you confess both the *name* and *nature*, *viz.* that it is *Righteousness*: Only you deny, that we are *justified by it*; whereby you have saved me the labour that I intended of proving it further to be Righteousness.

2. But is it not a strange *Righteousness* that will *not justifie?* either you mean, that [we are not *universally* justified by it;] and that I know no man that will affirm. Or you mean, that we are not justified by it against the *Accusation* of being *breakers of the first Law:* But so we are justified by it only

as

as *the Condition* of our intereſt in Chriſt. Or elſe you mean, that we are not *at all juſtified by it*, that is, not againſt the Accuſation of *non-performing the Conditions of the New-Covenant*; (and this you muſt mean, or you ſpeak not to me:) And this is very untrue. For, 1. If you mean it of *Juſtification conſtitutive*, then to ſay, [*It is Righteouſneſs, but will not juſtifie*;] is all one as to ſay, [*It is whiteneſs, but makes not white.*] [*It is paternitas vel filiatio, ſed non conſtituit patrem vel filium; ſanctitas, ſed non conſtituit ſanctum*] [*eſt forma, ſed non informat*] But [*formam ſequi debet nomen.*] If you mean it only *de Juſtificatione per ſententiam judicis*, then it is as much as to ſay, [*We are conſtituted righteous hereby, but ſhall not be judged to be ſo*;] *i.e.* the Judg will not judg the *righteous* to be *righteous*, ſo far as he *truly is righteous*. He that ſaith to the *righteous*, [*Thou art wicked,*] is not the Judg that muſt judg the World.

3. You will oppoſe [*that whereby we are juſtified,*] to [*that whereby we are ſanctified,*] as if the ſame thing might not do both. It conſtituteth us *holy*, as it is a ſanctifying quality. It denominateth us *Righteous*, as it is the *ſubjectum primum*, or *matter* of our *non-Reatus*.

4. The Texts cited make not *Righteouſneſs* and *Holineſs* ſo far ſeparate as you confeſs; nor yet *equipollent* terms; but only to be *concomitant*, and both together a fit deſcription of God's people: Scripture doth not ſo ordinarily tautologize, nor is it to be imagined.

5. *Righteouſneſs* and *Holineſs* are not all one, ſo much as *materially*. For the matter of our *Righteouſneſs* is our fulfulling of the *Condition as ſuch*; which

which is done by the ſincerity of Faith and Obedience, if there were no more: But the matter of our *Holineſs* lieth in our qualities and actions as they reſpect the *Precept* or Rule; and ſo they may contain in them more than mere ſincerity.

Aphoriſm.

Page 121. I *Have been ſorry to hear many Learned Teachers ſpeak thus.*

Animadverſ.

You mean, that our perſonal inherent Righteouſneſs is imperfect; and truly I am ſorry that any Learned Teacher ſhould diſlike this. This perſonal Righteouſneſs is the ſame with Holineſs, however you would make them to differ; and Holineſs here is but in perfecting, it is not perfected, 2 *Cor.* 7. 1.

Reply.

I mean as I ſpeak; and that was, [*that any ſhould ſay, That the godly are denominated Righteous (perſonally) only becauſe their Sanctification and Good-works have ſome imperfect agreement to the Law of Works:*] And ſo that we are *legally righteous* in our ſelves.

2. I think I have plainly ſhewed you, that Holineſs and Righteouſneſs differ *toto cælo formaliter*; and *much*, though not *wholly*, *materialiter*. Why did you not manifeſt the unſoundneſs of the differences which I expreſſed, but barely deny it? *Holineſs* is imperfect, but *Righteouſneſs* is *formaliter* perfect, or none at all: Yea, the *forma ſubjecti primi*, called the *materia*, is perfect too; for it lieth in the *Metaphyſical Truth* of our [*performing the Condition as ſuch*;] and therefore is convertible with the *entity* of that performance. But the *actions* whereby we ſo perform the Condition, are *not perfectly holy*; that is, they are not perfectly conform to the

Precept,

Precept, though they are *perfectly*, that is, *truly* a performing of the *Condition*, and so conform to the act of the Law which constituteth that Condition.

Aphorism.

Page 122. *Righteousness signifying a Conformity to the Rule; and a Conformity with a* quatenus *or an imperfect Rectitude, being not a true Conformity and Rectitude at all (because the Denomination of the whole action or person, and not of a certain part or respect;) therefore imperfect Righteousness is not Righteousness, but Unrighteousness: It is a Contradiction in* adjecto.

Animadverf.

I see not but that an imperfect Conformity to the Rule, may denominate a man righteous, though not perfectly righteous; as well as imperfect Qualifications (which you grant) may denominate one holy, though not perfectly holy: These two [Qualification] and [Conformity to the Rule,] being indeed the same. For what is the Qualification of the Soul, which makes it holy, but the Rectitude of it, and its Conformity to the Rule? which makes it righteous? And are not the wills of the Regenerate made comformable to the will of God, in some measure, and yet not in full measure? Was there not some Conformity to the Law in *Paul*, when he could say, *I delight in the Law of God after the inward man?* But was this a perfect Conformity when he was forced to say, *But I see another Law in my members*, &c. *Rom.* 7. 22, 23.

Reply.

1. That which you say you see not, is very discernable, if you will well consider what is before said. As *Schibler* saith, *de Similitudine*, in the place I cited, if you speak *stricte & Philosophice viz. de ipsa relatione, relatio non intenditur nec remittitur*: And so imperfect Conformity is a contradiction, as is imperfect Similitude: But if you speak vulgarly and laxly, not *de ipsa relatione, sed de relationis subjecto*,

jecto, quando fundatur in qualitate, you may say, *Relatio recipit magis & minus*, because that *Quality* doth so: And in this sense I grant, that *Paul's* good actions (and all the Saints) are conform in part (that is, draw near to Conformity to the Law of Works;) when speaking properly, they are Inconform. *Vide Schibler. Met. l. 2. c. 8. punct. 2. n. 199. & c. 9. Tit. 7. Art. 2.* he saith, it is but *Locutio popularis & non Philosophica* to say, *Similitude is intended and remitted*: And saith, that *æqualitas consistit in indivisibili & quasi centro. Vid. Topic. c. 22. Vid. Suar. Metaph. Disp. 48. §. 18, 34. Aquinas* saith, (though the contrary laxer speech may pass) *Relationes non recipiunt magis & minus, 12æ. q. 82. a. 4. c.*

3. But you must further remember, that this *relation* of [*Righteous,*] in the sense of the Law of Works, *fundatur non solum in Qualitate, sed & in Quantitate: Et relata quorum fundamentum est quantitas non recipiunt magis & minus, inquit Alsted. Metaph. & omnes Metaphysici uno ore.* This Righteousness is *quædam Æqualitas*: And *Equality* is founded in Quantity. *Bellarmine* himself could confess *(de Justif. l. 1. c. 1.) Porro justitia unde Justificatio nomen habet, nihil aliud est nisi ordinis Rectitudo: Id enim est justum quod rectum & Adequatum & cum sua regula optimè congruens.*

If therefore our Question be but of *one action*, that action is not *strictly Conform* to the *Law of Works* (the Precept) which is not *perfectly Conform*: But when we speak not of *one action*, but of the *Righteousness* of the person which is denominated from *all his actions* together, I thought the case had then been unquestionable, That there is none righteous,

no

no not one. Do you indeed hold, that a ſinner is truly righteous according to the Law of Works? If he be: 1. It is either with that Righteouſneſs which is a Conformity to the *Precept* as *Precept*, and is oppoſite to *Reatus culpæ*: (But that is utterly untrue, becauſe though the actions admit of *magis & minus*; yet *Conformity* and *relative Equality* do not, but ſtand *in centro*. And it is a perfect conformity, which that Law will call a Conformity, and doth expreſly require.) 2. Or it is with that Righteouſneſs which is in the performing of the *Condition*, and is oppoſed to *Reatus non præſtitæ conditionis*: (But that's as untrue; for in that Law, the *Precept* and *Condition* are both of an extent: The Condition is only *perfect Obedience.*) 3. Or it is with that Righteouſneſs which conſiſteth in *non-dueneſs of Puniſhment*, and is oppoſite to *Reatus pœnæ*: (But if that were but materially in imperfect works, according to the tenor of that Law, then Chriſt died in vain: And it is the perſon, and not the actions, that is the ſubject of that.)

4. You ſay, [*Qualification and Conformity*] *is the ſame.* Even as *Albedo* and *Similitudo*, or as *Subjectum & Accidens*, or as *Quantity* and *Relation* are the ſame.

You ask, [*What is the Qualification which makes it holy, but the Rectitude and Conformity to the Rule, which makes it righteous?*]

I reply, 1. If you take Holineſs (as now we do) for a *Quality*, then no relation doth conſtitute it certainly. But that Quality may be part of the matter or ſubject of the relation. 2. It's true, that *the Subjectum primum*, or the *materia* of our *Righteouſneſs* (now pleaded for) is the Conformity of our actions

actions and dispositions to the Rule. But the Question (you well know) is, To what Rule? And I say, 1. Not to the Law of Works. 2. Not to the Precept of the Gospel as such, in its fulness. 3. But to the *New-covenant*, as instituting the *Condition* of our participation of Christ. Our *Holiness* is the *matter* (as it is sincere, not as in this or that further degree) as it consisteth in *Faith* and *Repentance*, and *sincere Obedience*, which is conform to the *New-Law quoad Conditionem*; but it is not the Conformity it self, much less is it the Righteousness of the person, that is *formaliter* the *non-Reatus pœnæ Legis novæ*: Least of all is it a Conformity to the *Law of Works*, perfect or imperfect (for such there is none.) Yet if you will say, *In sensu populari & impropriâ* (as *Scribler* calls it) *& non Philosophica*, that our Holiness is imperfectly conform to the preceptive part of the New or Old Law, I will not contend about it. Only I must still desire you to know, that by [*Evangelical personal Righteousness*,] I mean, not *Holiness* in that sense; but I mean, *formaliter* our *non-Reatus pœnæ Evangelicæ: Et fundamentaliter*, 1. Our *Conformity* to that Law, as requiring the *Condition only*: And, 2. The *ipsa Conditionis præstatio*, wherein that *Conformity* doth consist: In a word, that we are not *rei non-præstitæ Conditionis*.

But because you so verily think, that the Law of Works doth call all Saints *truly righteous*, though *imperfectly*, I desire you to tell me these things: 1. Doth not Christ justifie the unrighteous, as to Legal Righteousness? How then do you prove them righteous according to that Law? 2. If the Law of Works call them truly righteous, then it will justifie them: For it cannot but justifie the just.

3. Doth

3. Doth not *James* ſay, he that offendeth in one, is guilty of all? How then can that Law know ſuch a thing as imperfect Righteouſneſs? 4. Doth not God ſay, *Prov.* 24. 24. *He that ſaith to the wicked,* [*Thou art righteous*] *Nations ſhall curſe him,* &c. *And he that juſtifieth the wicked, and condemneth the righteous, even they both are abomination to the Lord.* But if the Law pronounce an imperfect Obeyer righteous, and yet condemn him to Hell, it condemneth the righteous. 5. May not the damned and Devils be pronounced righteous by the Law of Works in your ſenſe? If any degree of (or rather towards) Conformity, give that title? And ſo alſo of all that periſh. For they do ſomewhat, in ſome reſpect, which the Law requireth: For I hope you will not ſay as the Phariſees, that the perſon is *righteous*, if *moſt* of his actions were *good*; and *unrighteous*, when moſt are bad, as *Paulus Burgenſ.* reprehends them (*Addit. in Lyram in Jacob.* againſt *Rab. Moſes*, and other of his Countrymen.) And *Burgenſ.* thinks *James* wrote purpoſely againſt that Doctrine. However you know, that the beſt man hath more faulty actions than faultleſs; nay, the beſt man never did one work which the Law of Innocency will call juſt, *Vid. Melanct. Loc. Com. de bonis operib. p.* 311. *Piſcat. Calv. Bulling. Pellican. Brochmond. &c. in Jac.* 2. 10. Dr. *Twiſs* ſaith, *Vindic.* Grat. l. 2. part. 1. c. 15. p. mihi 214. Col. 2. *Ad bonitatem moris quod attinet, falſum eſt actus iſtos bonos eſſe. Bonum enim non niſi ex integra cauſa conſtat: At ex quolibet defectu malum. Et quomodo dicantur illi per ſe boni quos agnoſcimus æternæ damnationis meritorios? Falſum eſt eum qui dat Eleemoſynam vanæ gloriæ ſtudio, bonum*

actum

actum præstare, ut probatum est. Quod vero addit [*sed perversè*] *perversè facit. Hoc enim innuit, eundem actum posse esse & moraliter bonum, & moraliter malum: quod falsum est.* Christ doth not out of the same mouth send forth Blessing and Cursing. There is no middle here with us, between Guilty, and Not-guilty, that is, Righteous. Indeed, as *Dissimilitude* and Inequality have degrees, though strictly *Similitude*, *Equality* and *Conformity* have none; so Unrighteousness hath degrees. The action also of a Devil may be just, and justified *secundum quid*, in some respect; but that denominateth not the action *righteous*, much less the Actor. I conclude with two Learned mens words: *Neque putandum est fieri posse ut per Legem, saltem aliqua ex parte justificemur*; (therefore we are not *aliqua ex parte justi.*) *Nam aut Legem transgressus es, aut non. Si non es Legem transgressus, Lege Justificaris: si transgressus es, Condemnaris. Inter Legis transgressionem & non-transgressionem, nihil potest esse medium. Itaq; aut omnino, aut nullo modo Lege Justificamur (vel justi sumus.)* Placæus Thes. Salmurienſ. Vol. 1. p. 29. §. 13.

And *Wotton* saith (*de Reconcil. part.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 5. *n.* 16.) *The Righteousness, whereof the Law is the Rule, is not the Righteousness of him that hath once transgressed the Law.* And *ibid. n.* 4. [*Where Righteousness, which is the way to life eternal, is the same, the Covenant of God concerning the obtaining eternal life must be the same. For the Covenant is divers, according to the nature of that Righteousness which is understood to be its Condition; seeing it is evident, that the Covenant doth depend upon its Condition, and from it, as it were, borrows its nature. But in the Law*

Law and the Goſpel, there is not the ſame Covenant for obtaining eternal life, Gal. 3. 17. *How therefore can the ſame Righteouſneſs be ſaid to be required in the Law and the Goſpel, when it is moſt evident that the Covenants are divers, or rather oppoſite.* So far Wotton.

Aphoriſm.

Page 123. *I Could here heap up a multitude of Orthodox Writers, that do call our perſonal Righteouſneſs by the title of Evangelical, as ſignifying by what Rule it doth receive its name.*

Animadverſ.

But do theſe Orthodox Writers ſay, that we are *juſtified* by this Righteouſneſs? Both imputed Righteouſneſs and inherent (which is the ſame with perſonal) Righteouſneſs, is Evangelical; *i. e.* ſuch as the Goſpel doth teach and require, though not both in a like manner; but the one unto Juſtification, the other unto Sanctification.

Reply.

1. But the preſent Queſtion is, *By what Rule* we are denominated *inherently righteous?* A man would think that here you grant, that it is not by the *Law of Works*, but of *Grace*.

2. It is prepoſterous to ſay, the Law of Chriſt requireth *Righteouſneſs* to *Sanctification* (in the common ſence of the word *Sanctification*,) that is, the *form* to the *matter*, the *relation* to the *ſubject*: *Albedinem ad parietem, ſimilitudinem ad albedinem, paritatem ad numeros, equalitatem ad quantitatem.* I ſhould put the other end firſt.

3. He that affirms a man *righteous*, and yet denieth that he may thereby be *juſtified*, *ſo far* as he is righteous, contradicteth himſelf. If you think, that by the words [*ſo far*,] I yield to different de-

grees of Righteousnes: I answer, Not *formaliter*, but only *subjectivè*, *vel materialiter*; and that only when a man hath *many causes*, or his Cause *many parts*; he may be righteous in one Cause, or one part of his Cause, and guilty in the rest. But take *every Cause*, or *part of his Cause* singly, and he is as to that either *Guilty* or *Not-guilty*, that is, *Righteous*. But as to the Law of Works, we are all guilty, and in respect of every action, though not each respect of each action: So that neither *person* nor *action* can by it be pronounced righteous. And our Righteousnes, or *non-Reatus pœnæ*, according to the Law of Grace, doth neither admit of degrees *formaliter*, *vel materialiter immediatè*, *sed tantum quoad materiam remotam*. For the *materia immediata* is *another relation* (*Conformity* to the Law as *instituting the Condition*:) and so it is *relatio fundata in relatione*. And this Condition again consisteth not in the *degree* of Holiness or Faith; but in the *sincerity* or *truth* of it. So that though *quoad substantiam*, a man may have more or less Faith and Obedience, yet *quoad impletionem conditionis* (which is not, to have *so much Faith*, but to *have Faith* in that degree as may constitute its *sincerity*) there is no degree: either we do fulfil it, or we do not, there is no *medium*.

Aphorism.

NO man is now under the Law as Adam *was before the New-Covenant was made; or so under the Law alone, as to have nothing to do with the Gospel; or so under the first Law, as to have no benefit by the new.*

Anim-

Animadverſ.

None are ſo under the Law or Old-Covenant, as to have no relief from the Goſpel, if they will fly to it, and embrace it. But all that remain in unbelief, are ſo far under the Old-Covenant, as to have no benefit by the Goſpel or New-Covenant, becauſe the benefit is only to thoſe that believe: Faith being the Condition of the New-Covenant, and no benefit is to be had by it, without performing the Condition of it; I ſpeak of the Covenant as conditional; for otherwiſe it is alſo abſolute, ſo as to promiſe that which it requireth, *Jer.*31.33. *Heb.*8.10.

Reply.

I think we differ not in this in ſenſe. But, 1. I ſpeak here (and moſt uſually) not of the Covenant as it is accepted by man, and ſo is mutual: But as it is propounded and enacted by God, and offered, and ſo is the ſame with the New-Law, conſiſting of Precept and Sanction. 2. So that here I included that Mercy, which in order to the ſpecial bleſſings of the Covenant, the Mediator of the Covenant doth offer and give to men. And ſo, 1. The very *Law* or *Covenant* it ſelf is a mercy to wicked men, however their abuſe or rejection may make it their ruine. The matter of it containeth unſpeakable mercies, even Pardon and Salvation; and for the extent of it, it is univerſal, and excludeth none: Though the *Promulgation* extend not to all, the *tenor* of the Covenant or Promiſe in it ſelf doth. All have there a conditional Pardon and Grant of Salvation freely given them under the hand of God: And though their unbelief deprive them of the actual enjoyment, yet the Grant (conditional) is even to the wicked an unſpeakable mercy; or elſe the rejecting of it would not be ſo great a ſin, nor ſo torment them for ever. 2. And there are other benefits ſubſervient and additional, which the worſt may receive. As to live among the godly, and

have their teaching, and examples, and prayers; to have the preaching of the Word, to have external and internal common mercies, leading to Repentance. These are not given merely to Believers, or on Condition of Faith. 3. The like may be said of those great mercies which are the foundation of the New-Covenant; *viz.* The Death of Christ, which was a Satisfaction sufficient for the sins of the whole World, and in some sort was made for all. 4. Yet I agree with you fully (and often so expressed my self) that Unbelievers are under the Curse of the Law, and unpardoned, and without right to Salvation.

Aphorism.

Page 125. *Faith is our Evangelical Righteousness, &c.*

Animadverf.

Faith is the Condition whereby we obtain Evangelical Righteousness: Which Righteousness is indeed Christ's Satisfaction; only Faith is required of us, that this Righteousness may be imputed to us.

Reply.

Enough is said to this before, 1. *Christ's Satisfaction* is *strictly* our *Legal Righteousness*, as you confessed; because it is a Satisfaction to the Law of Works (as you speak) or to God as Legislator and Judg according to that Law: But *accidentally* it may be called our *Evangelical Righteousness*, because the Gospel *revealeth* and *conferreth* it.

2. Faith is no part of this *Legal Righteousness*, nor tends to *satisfie God's justice*, nor *deserves* any thing of him; but is (as you truly say) the Condition only of our enjoying it.

3. This

3. This *Condition* is imposed by a *New-Law*, which was made for the right conveyance of the fruits of Christ's Satisfaction: And so is the *Righteousnes* of that New-Law, as the performance of the Condition of a Law-Testament or Covenant, is that which it denominateth Righteous. And so you confess Faith to be our Evangelical Righteousnes, when-ever you confess it to be the Condition of that Law or Covenant. And when the case in question is, Whether we have performed or fulfilled the Condition of Christ's New-Law or Covenant? then Faith is that Righteousnes by which materially we must be justified, or we perish. This is the sum of all in brief.

Aphorism.

Page 127. *Whosoever will accept him, and believe in him, who hath thus satisfied, it shall be as effectual for their Justification, as if they had fulfilled the Law of Works themselves.*

Animadvers.

Well, yet not properly the accepting Christ, but his Satisfaction accepted of us, and imputed to us, is that whereby we are justified: As it is not properly the accepting of a gift, but the gift it self that doth enrich; though it must be accepted that it may do it. This similitude seems more suitable, than that of the pepper-corn which you use.

Reply.

Why did you not set against the Distinction and Explication that I gave, *p.* 127, 128? In point of *Satisfaction*, *Merit* or *Value*, *Acceptance*, i. e. *Faith*; is no part of our Righteousnes. But God resolved there should be *some Condition* of our *personal performance* to make that *ours*, which *naturally* was *none of ours*, but performed by *another*: And so in

that respect, *Faith it self* is imputed to us instead of the *personal performance* of perfect Obedience, that is, it shall as fully serve to our Justification. In our *perfect personal Obedience* to the Law of Works, these two would have been conjoyned, the *Value*, and the *personal Performance*: But now *Christ's Satisfaction* is the *whole* in point of *value* or *merit*; but he bought us to *his service*, and he resolveth that somewhat of *our own performance* shall intercede as a *Condition*. And so *Faith* is as effectual or sufficient a *Condition* under the New-Covenant, as *perfect Obedience* would have been under the Old; and Christ's Satisfaction is of as full a *value* now, as that Obedience would have been then. I thought this had been plain, easie, true Scripture-Doctrine. And so I see no unfitness in my similitude of a Pepper-corn, so be it you will do me that Justice, as to understand that I do by it only include the *necessity* of the Act of *Homage*, or acknowledgment of the Redeemers Dominion, and our subjection thereto, and that I exclude the *rationem pretii*. And if the *valuableness* of a *Pepper-corn* should make you think otherwise (contrary to the express words of my Application) you shall change the name to *a grain of Sand*, or a *verbal Acknowledgment*. And yet (be it spoken in your ear) when we preach *ad populum* of the necessity of Striving, Running, using Violence for Heaven, working out our Salvation, forsaking all for Christ, suffering with him that we may reign with him, *&c.* we do not so scrupulously avoid all that may possibly intimate *rationem pretii*, as a poor Pepper-corn comes too. I well remember you once preached a Sermon with me at *Bridgnorth*, on that in *Ephesians*, [*See*

that

that ye walk circumſpectly;] wherein you (learnedly, honeſtly and ſoundly) ſpake as much in the commendation of *Holy-walking*, as any phraſe of a *Pepper-corn* intimates at leaſt.

2. And for your fitter ſimilitude, I ſay, it is eaſie to apprehend, that the Gift enricheth *quoad Dignitatem*; but the *Acceptance ut medium fruitionis*. But you muſt diſtinguiſh between a *gift abſolutely given*, (wherein *accepting* is but *naturaliter* neceſſary, and in ſome caſes not neceſſary at all;) and a *gift conditionally given*, *Acceptance* being the *Condition* (and given by a Law or Act of Grace;) wherein *Acceptance* is alſo *moraliter neceſſary* to the actual fruition. For in this latter caſe, the tryal of his Title in Law, depends mainly on the tryal and proof of this his Acceptance.

Aphoriſm.

Page 129. *THe value of Chriſt's Satisfaction is imputed to us, inſtead of the value of a perfect Obedience of our own performing.*

Animadverſ.

And by this value of Chriſt's Satisfaction imputed to us, are we juſtified; not by our own perſonal performance of Faith properly, but only as it ſerves to make Chriſt's Satisfaction ours, whereas without Faith we have nothing to do with it.

Reply.

Your [*but only as*] contradicts your [*not properly.*] For it is proper to ſay, [*We are juſtified by Faith*] as a *Condition*; as it is to ſay, [*We are juſtified by Chriſt's Satisfaction*] as the *meritorious Cauſe*. Or elſe *Paul* (and all the Scripture) ſpeaks oftner improperly than properly. For they never ſpeak of being juſtified by Chriſt's Satisfaction (though there be that which is equivalent in other terms) but

many a time they ſpeak of being juſtified by Faith. See *Wotton* of this.

Aphoriſm.

Page 131. *BUt whether all this Imperfection be privative and ſinful*, &c. *is a queſtion*, &c.

Animadverſ.

I think there is no queſtion to be made, but that the imperfection of Holineſs, which doth proceed from admixture of contrary qualities (as immediately before you grant this doth) is ſinful. For what qualities but ſinful, are contrary to Holineſs? And is not Imperfection ſinful, which doth proceed from the admixture of ſinful qualities? *Let us cleanſe our ſelves* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *from all filthineſs of fleſh and ſpirit, perfecting holineſs in the fear of God*, 2 Cor. 7. 1. It is filthineſs which abiding ſtill in us, doth make our Holineſs here imperfect: From which filthineſs therefore we muſt ſtill cleanſe our ſelves, that our Holineſs may be more and more perfect.

Reply.

1. *Concedo totum.* I never intended to ſpeak otherwiſe: When I ſaid, [*It is a queſtion which will be decided, when I ſpeak of the extent of the Command or Rule,*] I intended the confuting more fully of them that are otherwiſe-minded, and not to make it doubtful.

2. Yet upon review, as the words lie, I muſt maintain the Negative in ſome ſenſe. For the doubt is, Whether *all* this Imperfection be ſinful? But as it is imperfect *participativè & efficienter*, ſo it is not ſinful: For ſo it is conſidered only as an imperfect work of God's Spirit, that is, a work which he hath begun, but not yet finiſhed: And as ſo related to him it is not ſinful; for he was not bound to perfect it ſooner, or to ſanctifie us all at once in perfection.

Aphor.

Aphoriſm.

Page 132. *Righteouſneſs is not a quality, as Holineſs is; but the Modification of our Acts as to the Rule, which is not varied* ſecundum magis & minus.

Animadverſ.

For any thing I yet ſee, a thing may be more or leſs conformed to its Rule; and Righteouſneſs (being underſtood of that which is inherent and perſonal) is really the ſame with Holineſs, as I have noted before. Neither ſhould you (as you ſeem to do) appropriate Righteouſneſs more than Holineſs to our Actions: There is habitual Righteouſneſs, as well as actual, and actual Holineſs, as well as habitual. Righteouſneſs and Holineſs equally agree, both to our perſons, and to our actions, *Epheſ.* 4. 24. & 1 *Pet.* 1. 15.

Reply.

1. If we ſpeak of *Conformity to a Rule* in general, when that *Relation* is founded in *Quality*, which admitteth of *Intenſion* and *Remiſſion*, then *ſubjectivè vel materialiter*, the *Relation* may be ſaid to be *intended or remitted*; but not *formaliter*, *vel quoad eſſe relationis*. I cannot more fully expreſs this, than in *Schibler's* words, Metaph. l. 2. c. 9. Tit. 7. A. 2. *Dico 2. quod etiam relata ex parte ſui, hoc eſt, ſecundum eſſe relationis ipſius, non ſuſcipiunt magis & minus. Intenſio (n.) facit ut entitas ſubjecto conveniat perfectiore modo, & remiſſio ut modo imperfectiore. At ſimilitudo & æqualitas; v.g. conſiſtunt in indiviſibili: veluti ſi quæ conveniunt ſimpliciter in forma aliqua dicuntur ſimilia: & ſi habeant eandem quantitatem dicuntur paria: & hinc paritas vel æqualitas adeo exactam convenientiam ſignificant, & nullam prorſus latitudinem admittat illa æqualitas. Atq; hinc imprimis hoc dictum* Ariſtotelis *intelligendum eſt juxta popularem modum loquendi (viz. Relata ſuſcipere intenſionem & remiſſionem) quo* Ariſt. *in Categoriis ſæpius*

uſus

usus est, prout interpretatur Tolet. Conimbric. Fonseca, *&c. Potest autem istud loquendi genus fundari in similitudinibus, v. g. discretis: veluti conveniunt alicui rei plura attributa: veluti homini, esse, vivere, intelligere, &c. Hinc igitur homo, v. g. est similior Deo quam lapis, quia pluribus attributis Deo convenit quam lapis: sic siqui conveniant in eadem ætate & statura & doctrina, æqualiores sunt quam si in sola ætate æquentur. 2. Potest ea æqualitatis (de ea enim potissima est difficultas) intensio & remissio fundari in majori recessu ab extremo. Etsi (n.) æqualitas præcisè sit quasi in centro posita, tamen isto populari genere loquendi illud censebitur æqualius alii quod ab extremo magis ad centrum vergit. Veluti, si numerus aliquis sit, ut decem, in duobus extremis est æqualitas, &c. Hic numerus ad novem æqualior est istis quam numerus ad quatuor: quia novem magis recedunt ab extremo, h. e. ab uno, quam quatuor. Cum alias absolute & Philosophicè loquendo, hic nulla simpliciter sit æqualitas.*

2. If you speak of Conformity to the Rule of *Precept* as such, the same Answer serves: It may be conform *in pluribus vel paucioribus partibus materiæ*, but those are formaliter *conformitates discretæ*. But yet though *de posse* I say, [*it may be*] *de facto*.] I say, in our case it *is not* so: For the Act is not *divisible into parts conform*, and *parts inconform*; and no man ever performeth one act fully and exactly conform to the Law of Works, or (I think) to the preceptive part of Christ's Law as such. But if this were otherwise, it were nothing to our business: For this is not *our Righteousness*.

3. But (as I have told you) our Righteousness is *formaliter non reatus pœnæ*; And is there any degrees of that? Every man is *Guilty*, or *Not-guilty*.

Guilty

Guilty is varied, both as to the ſeveral cauſes or parts thereof, and the ſeveral degrees of penalty due: But when the cauſe is one, and it is one penalty that we are accuſed to be liable to, we can be but *Not-guilty*; and if we are not ſo, we are *Guilty*. 2. This *Not-guiltineſs*, as it reſpecteth the penalty of the Law of Works, is *fundamentaliter* from the gift of the Law of Grace. And there is here no degrees; either Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs is imputed and given to us, or not; but not with a *magis* or *minus*. 3. This Righteouſneſs is *materialiter* in *Chriſt's Satisfaction*; and that alſo is not varied, though he might have ſatisfied for ſome ſins or perſons only, yet he hath done it fully: And between ſatisfying and not-ſatisfying, there is no mean; nor is this the Righteouſneſs now in queſtion.

4. This Righteouſneſs is *conditionaliter* in *our Faith*; or rather, *our Faith* is the *Condition* of it. And this admits not of degrees: For it is the *leaſt degree* of *ſincere Faith* that is the *Condition*; and the higheſt degree is no more, nor will juſtifie more. The ſtrongeſt Believer doth believe more than the weakeſt; but doth not more *perform the Condition of Juſtification*. For it is the verity of that Faith, which the Goſpel hath made the Condition, which is our ſincerity; and this is convertible with the Entity.

5. And for the Righteouſneſs which is oppoſed to *Reatus pœnæ novæ Legis*, it is a relation founded in another relation (Conformity;) and that Conformity is not to the Precept as ſuch, but to the Law as requiring the Condition (which great Divines call the ſpecifick form of the Covenant or Law;) and this Condition is our Righteouſneſs in the ſenſe explained, and admits not of degrees as a Condition, as is laſt ſaid.

Though

Though if you go yet further from the form, and consider our Gospel-Righteousness neither *in esse non Reatus pœnæ*, nor *in esse relativo Conformitatis ad Legem conditionem instituentem*, nor *in esse reali Conditionis-præstitæ*, but *in esse Officii*, as related to, or measured by the *Precept*, and that only *quoad materiam Præceptam*; so I confess that our Faith and Holiness admit of degrees. And I think this Answer is plain, and the distinction necessary, and not vainly nice.

2. And where you still say, that Holiness and Righteousness is all one; I have told you (I think sufficiently) a wide difference. If you take Holiness for passive Dedication to God, or the Relation of a thing consecrated or separated to God; so I told you it is indeed a *Relation*, but not the same with *Righteous*: If you take it for the *Quality* of our new-spiritual life; or the Habits of Grace, so it is *materially* the same thing with part of our Evangelical Righteousness in question, but not *formally*; nay, nor *materially*, as it is considered in any high degree, but merely as *Sincere*. If you consider it as those *actions* which are *commanded*, it is *materially another* part of our Righteousness: For it is the same act which the Law makes a Condition, which it also makes to be *Officium*; and it is *first Officium* in order of nature, and then *Conditio*. But there is more made *Officium*, than is made the *Condition* properly and *per se*. But you after seem to take [*Holiness*] *formaliter* in a sense yet differing from all these, that is, as it is the *Conformity* (perfect or imperfect) of *Habits* or *Actions* to the *Rule*: The same with *bonum Morale*, as opposite to *sin*. And so it seems to me, you make all the *good actions* of

of the *Heathens holy*: for you think, that an *exact Conformity* is not the only *true Conformity*. But in this ſenſe (if it be *good*) Holineſs and Righteouſneſs much differ: It is indeed the ſame with that Righteouſneſs which is oppoſed to *Reatus culpæ*; (if any man were found that had any ſuch Righteouſneſs according to the Law of Works, when indeed the beſt are but leſs unrighteous.) But it is not the ſame with [*performance of the Condition*] *formally*; much leſs the ſame formally with our *non-Reatus pœnæ*. Holineſs in your ſenſe as *bonum*, is denominated from its congruency to the *Precept* as a *Precept*: But I hope you will acknowledg a wide difference between thoſe two Acts of the New-Law, *inſtituere Officium*, and *inſtituere Conditionem*; between; [*Do this*,] ſimply taken; and, [*Do this, and live.*]

3. Your Charge (of my placing Righteouſneſs only in *Acts*, and Holineſs in *Habits*) is utterly againſt my oft expreſs words. I ſay of Righteouſneſs, *p.* 132. that [*it is the relative conſideration of theſe Qualities*, &c.] p. 134. that [*it may be materially conſidered in Holineſs*,] and divers the like. Yet let me tell you, that (though the Precept do require *Habits*, whatſoever *L. V.* in *Crellio Refutato* ſay to the contrary, yet) he that ſhould maintain againſt you, that it is not *habitual Faith*, but *actual*, which is properly *& in ſe*, the *Condition* of the Covenant, would put you hard to it; and perhaps not croſs your own, or the common Principles; though I am not now of that opinion which excludes the Habit.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *OUr Divines usually say, That our Justification is perfect, though our Sanctification be not; and then I am sure our Righteousness must be perfect.*

Animadvers.

True: Our Righteousness whereby we are justified must be perfect. But our Divines you know hold, that the Righteousness whereby we are justified, is not our personal Righteousness, but the Righteousness of Christ through faith imputed to us; neither do I as yet see any cause to desert this Doctrine.

Reply.

I must say, that I like not the saying that our Justification is perfect, for many Reasons: But you grant as much as I desire for the *major* Proposition, [*That the Righteousness whereby we are justified must be perfect:*] And I think I have proved the *minor* already, [*But the performing the Condition of the New-Covenant, is a Righteousness by which we must be justified;*] viz. in *subordination* to Christ's Righteousness; that is, against the *Accusation* of being *rei pœnæ novæ Legis*, for *non*-performance of its Conditions. And methinks it should need no proof: But yet I am willing that this phrase be be cast aside, lest it be misunderstood.

Aphorism.

Page 133. *SIncerity is usually said to be our Gospel-perfection; not as it is accepted instead of perfection, but as it is truly so. For sincere Faith is our Conformity to the Rule of Perfection*, viz. *The New-Covenant as it is a Covenant.*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

Sincerity is ſuch perfection as doth conſiſt with imperfection: For one is more or leſs ſincere, as more or leſs free from admixtures of Hypocriſie, and ſo more or leſs perfect. Neither can you (I think) evade by your diſtinction which you add immediately after; *viz.* That ſincere Faith as ſuch, is only materially our Righteouſneſs and Perfection; but formally, as it's relatively our Conformity to the ſaid Rule. For (ſo far as I can yet diſcern) Conformity to a Rule doth not conſiſt in ſuch an indiviſible point, but that there may be degrees of it: So that one may be more or leſs (perſonally) righteous, as well as more or leſs holy. And ſo much may be underſtood by that, *Rev.*22.11. *Let him that is righteous, be righteous ſtill; and let him that is holy, be holy ſtill; i. e.* Let him not only continue righteous and holy, but alſo labour to be more righteous and holy: And doth not the Apoſtle require of thoſe that are righteous and holy, that they be *renewed in the ſpirit of their mind, and put on the new-man, which after God is created in Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs?* Ephel.4.23,24.

Reply.

1. I doubt not but *ſincerity of Righteouſneſs* conſiſteth with *imperfection of Holineſs*, or of the *matter* of that Righteouſneſs. Sincerity is taken by Divines: 1. For a *Moral Vertue* (or if you will, a ſpiritual Grace.) 2. For the *Metaphyſical Verity* of that Grace which we have. And thus they doubly uſe the word [*Hypocriſie*:] 1. For that Vice, which makes a man deſire and endeavour to ſeem better than he is. 2. For a ſeeming or appearing better than we are, or to do what we do not, though without affectation or diſſimulation: For the falſity of that ſeeming-ſincerity as a Vertue, is oppoſed to the firſt kind of Hypocriſie, *viz.* as a particular Vice; and thus you ſeem to take it: And ſo no doubt

All this is but a ſtrife about the word [*Perfect.*] And I repent that I uſed the word, becauſe moſt may miſtake it, and it may do harm.

doubt but *Sincerity* may be more or leſs, as it hath leſs or more *Hypocriſie* mixt with it. If you take it in the ſecond ſenſe, ſo *Sincerity* is no *particular Vertue* (nor the oppoſite *Hypocriſie* any *particular Vice*) but the *Metaphyſical Truth* of our *Vertues*, which is nothing really diſtinct from them. But thus it is not very proper to ſpeak of the *admixture of Hypocriſie*, *q.d.* a mixture of Verity and Falſity, Entity and *non*-Entity. But let that paſs.

This *laſt Sincerity* is, 1. Either the *Sincerity*, or *Truth* of the *Habit* or *Act* in its *Phyſical* Conſideration: (And ſo the Acts or Habits may be encreaſed, but the Metaphyſical Truth of each particular or degree is ſtill a Concomitant *modus* of the Being, not capable of Intenſion or Remiſſion in it ſelf immediately, but as the Entity is intended or remitted.) 2. Or it is the truth of their Vertuouſneſs or Goodneſs-Moral, which is their Denomination, as they are ſuited with the Precept, [*Do this:*] And ſo neither the Sincerity, nor the Goodneſs or Conformity have *formaliter* any Degrees; but *materialiter vel ſubjectivè* (they may, and commonly be, ſo ſpoke of, becauſe *vel plures, vel pauciores materiæ partes ſunt conformes regulæ:*) But in our caſe, as to the Divine Rule, I have told you before, how inconform we are, and all our actions. But yet this is not the Sincerity that I ſpeak of. 3. Sincerity therefore is taken here by me, for the *Metaphyſical Truth of our performance of the Condition of the Covenant.* And therefore I ſaid, [*It is our Conformity to the Rule*; viz. *the Covenant as a Covenant,*] to diſtinguiſh it from Conformity to the *preceptive* part as ſuch. This is the *Sincerity* of our Graces or Duties, not *Phyſically*, as Habits or Acts

(that

(that is preſuppoſed) not *morally, quoad præceptum* only, as vertuous or good: 4. But *ſavingly, quoad conditionem:* As I have more fully opened to you in *Chap.* 11. of my *Treat. of Reſt, Edit.* 2, & 3. whither I muſt refer you for a fuller Explication of my ſenſe of this. Now in this ſenſe Sincerity admits of *no degrees*; for there is no *medium* between *ens* and *non-ens*: And this Sincerity is but the Metaphyſical Verity of that Faith (whether in kind or degree differing from other Faith, is nothing to this Controverſie) which the Covenant hath made its Condition. Every man is either a ſincere, that is, true performer of that Condition, or he is not; and no man is more truly a performer of it than other.

2. I have therefore over and over ſhewed you, that Conformity to the *Rule of the Condition* doth conſiſt in ſuch an *indiviſible punctum*, that though one may *præſtare conditionem fortius & alacrius* than another, yet none doth more truly perform it, or is more a performer of it, and conſequently not more righteous in that ſenſe. As our Divines uſe to ſay, A weak hand may as truly receive a Pearl, as a ſtrong; and a weak Faith as truly receive Chriſt. If a Pearl be given to ten men, on condition they take it; he that takes it feebly, hath as good right to it, as he that graſps it hard: And if their right be called in Queſtion, it will prove that the *Titulus* or *Conditio* was not ſtrong apprehending, but apprehending; and therefore the caſe will not be, [Whether he *ſtrongly*, but whether he *truly* took it?] And there will be no more, but a *Guilty*, or *Not-guilty* in that point of Verity, to *turn* all. If he *truly took* it, his cauſe is righteous, and there-

fore he is in that righteous, and therefore ſhall be juſtified.

3. I ſee not what the two Texts cited make againſt this: *Rev.* 22. 11. either ſpeaks not of *encreaſe* of Righteouſneſs, but *perſeverance* (and yet it may of Holineſs; for you know it is uſual to vary the ſenſe of the ſame Adjunct or Precept, according to the variety of ſubjects:) Or, 2. If it ſpeak of Righteouſneſs *in eſſe materiali & non formali*, that is nothing againſt what I ſay. I am ſure it proves, that there is a true perſonal Righteouſneſs in the Saints, and that cannot be *in ſenſu Legis operum*.

Epheſ. 4. 23, 24. 1. The Apoſtle ſeems not to preſs on them a duty *de novo*, but to ſuppoſe that already done which he mentioneth: [*If ſo be that ye have heard of him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jeſus, that ye put off the old man*, &c.

2. If it be not ſo, yet [*putting off the old man, and putting on the new,*] is uſually ſpoke to thoſe that yet have not put on the new. And *Paul* wrote to more than ſincere Chriſtians, though to none but Profeſſors.

3. If you were ſure he ſpoke to none but the Saints, yet the words imply not any encreaſe of their *Righteouſneſs*, but of that *new man* which is *created in Righteouſneſs* and *Holineſs*; that is, whoſe nature and excellency conſiſteth in being *righteous* and *holy*: One of which may yet encreaſe, and not the other.

4. If yet this were otherwiſe, all that you can think to prove is, that the word [*Righteouſneſs*] is uſed for the *matter*, and not the *form* of Righteouſneſs.

5. *Righ-*

5. *Righteousnes* is oft taken in Scripture for that Vertue which consisteth in *tribuendo suum cuiq;*. And so especially, as it respecteth God; giving to God the things that are Gods, and to men, that which is mens; and consequently obeying him. But this is not the Righteousnes now in question.

In all this, Perfection is taken for reality of the relation only: And the strife is vain.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *OUr Righteousnes is perfect, as in its Being, so also in order to its end. The end is to be the Condition of our Justification,* &c.

Animadverf.

The end of our Faith is to be the Condition of our Justification; but not considered as it is our Righteousnes, *viz.* a part of our Inherent Righteousnes, but as it receives Christ the Lord our Righteousnes, *Jer.* 23. 6. *viz.* whereby we are justified.

Reply.

This is very true, as to the first Justification, from the Accusation of *Reatus pœnæ primæ Legis propter peccatum:* For so Faith justifies only as the *Condition* of our participation in Christ and his Righteousnes (which I am glad you grant:) But as to the second Justification, from the Accusation of *Reatus pœnæ novæ Legis ob non præstitam conditionem*, Faith is *materially* that *our Righteousnes*. The confounding these two Justifications, and the confounding the Rule of Duty (*Precept*) and the Rule of the *Condition*, or the Law as instituting the Condition, and so the *præstatio Officii*, and *præstatio Conditionis*, is the thing that bringeth all this darkness into your discourse (as it appears to me.)

Aphorism.

Ibid. *So that our Righteousness formally considered, in relation to the New-Covenant, is perfect, or none.*

Animadvers.

1. Inherent Righteousness may be true, and yet imperfect, and that formally considered in relation to the New-Covenant. For the New-Covenant as it accepts of sincere Righteousness; so it requires an encrease of it, which needed not, nor could be, if it were perfect.

2. You speak of that Righteousness whereby we are justified, and suppose it to be Faith; whereas Faith is a hand to receive that Righteousness, that we may be justified by it.

Reply.

I will not molest you with repeating any more the former Reply: only consider, how *Reatus, vel non-Reatus pœnæ* can be *formaliter* encreased. And lest you think me singular in making *Righteousness* (of this sort) to consist in that, hear our Learned *Gataker* (specially well studied in these points) *cont. Lucium Vind. part.* 1. *sect.* 2. *n.* 34. *In re judiciariâ insons omnis pro justo habetur, Sons & iusons sunt ex oppositis* ὧν ὄδεν ἀνὰ μεσόν. So he interpreteth *Deut.* 25. 1. (ibid. n. 21. pag. 32.) *Si controversia inter aliquos extiterit & ad judicium res delata fuerit, justificent (judices scil.) eum qui justus (hoc est insons) fuerit, eum vero qui improbus (hoc est sons) fuerit condemnent.* Vid. & n. 19, 20. &c. p. 31. *Et idem contra Gomarum*, pag. 35, 36. *Non hoc dicitur, Deum apud se judicare illos pro quorum peccatis universis Christus satisfecit, nihil mali unquam commisisse, aut boni debiti omisisse: Sed eodem habere loco quoad mortis Reatum & jus ad vitam æternam, ac si nihil vel mali admisissent, vel boni debiti omisissent.*

Let

Let me add the words of *Placæus*, Theſ. Salmurienſ. Vol. 1. p. 27. *Juſtus ſumi poteſt vel morali vel forenſi ſignificatione. Morali, ut opponitur τῷ ἀδίκῳ, eumq; ſignificet qui præditus eſt virtute ea quæ juſtitia dicitur*, &c. *Forenſi ut opponitur τῷ ὑποδίκῳ καταδίκῳ, eumq; ſignificet in quem Lege agere non licet; qui jure condemnari non poteſt à judice, nedum puniri: ſic nos*, &c.

I have heard ſome object merely from the name, that this is to make Righteouſneſs to be only a Negation of guilt: But let them change the name, and call the guilty, *Non-juſtus*, or *Non-abſolvendus*, and then they are pleaſed.

And let me note one thing more here, leſt you ſhould think this to be *Righteouſneſs nimis improprie ſic dicta*; *viz.* that as Righteouſneſs is moſt *ſtrictly in ſenſu forenſi* oppoſed to *guilt*, ſo *guilt of puniſhment* is ſo properly called guilt, as well as *Reatus culpæ* is; that the *Reatus culpæ* alone is ſeldomer mentioned by Divine or Humane Writers, but they commonly define guilt (as if they took notice of no other ſort) thus, *Reatus eſt obligatio ad pœnam.*

Aphoriſm.

Page 134. *But conſidered materially, as it is Holineſs*, &c.

Animadverſ.

Here you grant, that Righteouſneſs (*i.e.* perſonal inherent Righteouſneſs) is the ſame with Holineſs, and ſo imperfect. For your diſtinction of Materiality and Formality of Righteouſneſs, I have ſaid ſome thing to it before. Neither do I ſee but Holineſs alſo may admit the ſame diſtinction. For though Holineſs materially conſidered be a quality (as you ſay it is, *page* 132.) and ſo alſo is habitual Righteouſneſs, which is as you acknowledg, materially conſidered, nothing but Holineſs; yet Holineſs as well as Righteouſneſs formally conſidered, is a

Conformity to the Rule, *viz.* the Law of God. For Holiness is opposite to sin, and sin is a deviation from the Rule, therefore Holiness is a Conformity to it.

Reply.

I answered this particularly before. Holiness (in your sense, as you take it for *Goodness*) is a Conformity (*imperfecti quoad partes vel respectus materiæ conformis*) to the Law, as it doth *constituere Debitum officii*: Righteousness is, 1. *Non-Reatus pœnæ.* 2. A Conformity to the Rule, as it constituteth *Conditionem præmii obtinendi, & pœnæ vitandæ*; or, as Divines use to say, as it is a *Covenant*, or respecteth the Sanction.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *YEt it is an improper speech of some Divines, that Christ first justifieth our persons, and then our duties and actions. And except by* [Justifying] *they mean his* esteeming them *to be a fulfilling of the* Gospel-Conditions, *and so just, it is unsound and dangerous, as well as improper.*

Animadverf.

I think those Divines mean thus: That in and through Christ, first our persons are *accepted* of God, and then our *performances*: And in this I see nothing improper, much less unsound and dangerous. *God hath made us accepted in the Beloved*, Ephes. 1. 6. and as us, so also our services: *Our spiritual Sacrifice is acceptable to God through Christ*, 1 Pet. 2. 5. And the acceptation of our persons, is before the acceptation of our performances: *The Lord had respect to* Abel, *and to his Offering*, Gen. 4. 4. First to *Abel*, and then to his Offering. *Non* Abel *ex muneribus, sed ex* Abel *munera placuerunt*, saith *Gregory*.

Reply.

1. I never doubted of the *acceptance* of our duties;

ties; but I am far from thinking yet, that *Acceptance* is properly *juſtifying*.

2. I ſhall in reply to your next Section, recant part of this; but not to your mind.

3. I am not now of your opinion (if generally underſtood of *all works* or duties) that God *firſt accepteth* our *perſons*, and then our *works*. 1. If you mean by [*Accepting our perſons*,] *election* of them to *Acceptance and Life*, I confeſs it is Antecedent, but not cauſal of the Acceptance of our duties. 2. The like I yield of his Philanthropy, if that be called [*Accepting our perſons*.] 3. But if you mean (as doubtleſs you do) the accepting our perſons as Members of Chriſt, and reconciled to him, and ſo the lawful Objects of his ſpecial Love, I deny your Aſſertion; and I affirm, That the *Act and Habit of Faith* are *accepted of God*, in *order of Nature*, before *our perſons* are ſo *accepted*: 1. For Faith is the *Condition* of that *Acceptance* of our perſons; and I know, I need not prove to you, that the *Condition* and its Acceptance, go before the benefit given on that Condition. The *Acceptance of our perſons*, is the ſame as *Reconciliation*, *Juſtification*, *Adoption* in effect: For it is God's accepting us, as reconciled, juſtified, adopted ones. And is not the *Acceptance* of *Faith*, yea, and Knowledg, Repentance, before theſe? The Queſtion is in effect the ſame with that which we commonly debate with the Antinomians, Whether we are reconciled, juſtified, adopted, before we repent and believe? 2. The contrary opinion makes God an Accepter of perſons, in the ſenſe that is ſo oft diſclaimed by him in Scripture.

If any ask, *How can he accept the faith of a perſon not accepted, and unreconciled?*

I answer, For his Christ, his Covenant and Promise sake; and also, that Faith is the work of his Spirit, bringing the person into an acceptable state: And this leads me to a third Concession.

4. I yield that there is such a preparation to our acceptance made in the Satisfaction of Christ, as paid to God and accepted, that (the great impediments being removed) all men may be said, to be conditionally accepted before they believe: God is so far reconciled to Mankind in general, that he treats with them on new terms, and offers them actual Peace and Acceptance on very reasonable Conditions, consistent with the freeness of his gift.

5. And I grant you also, that our persons must be justified and reconciled, before our *external obedience* can be accepted, such as *Abel*'s Sacrifice was; but not before our *Faith*, *Repentance*, and *Love* can be accepted. The general effect of Christ's Death, extendeth so far, as to procure Acceptance of our *Faith*, (in order of nature, but not of time) before the Acceptance of our *persons*, by special Reconciliation. I like not therefore *Gregories* phrase, though his sense be good: I should say, *Nec* Abel *ex muneribus, nec ex* Abel *munera, sed ex Christo & fœdere Gratiæ, &* Abel *& munera placuerunt.*

But by the way (from your instance) take notice, that it was not as they were an imperfect Conformity to the Law of Works, that *Abel*'s Works were accepted; for the Text expresly saith, It was *by Faith* that Abel *offered a more excellent Sacrifice than* Cain; *by which he obtained witness that he was righteous; God testifying of his gifts*, Heb. 11.4.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 135. *IT is improper in the best sense; because it is contrary to the Scripture-use of the word* [Justifying] *which is the acquitting of us from the Charge of breaking the Law, and not from the Charge of violating the New-Covenant.*

Animadverſ.

Justifying, as the Scripture doth use the Word, is the acquitting of us from all sin. *For he is justified, to whom the Lord doth not impute sin*, Rom. 4. 8. *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect?* (*viz.* when they are justified?) *'tis God that justifieth*, Rom. 8. 33. *Now all sin is a breaking of the Law*, 1 John 3. 4. Your selves say, *p.* 147. [There's no sin prohibited in the Gospel, which is not a breach of some one Precept in the Decalogue.] But what all this which you here say, is to your purpose; *viz.* To prove that the forementioned saying of Divines is improper, I confess I cannot well see. For though (as you say) Justifying in Scripture is the acquitting of us from the Charges of breaking the Law, and not from the Charge of violating the New-Covenant, may it not yet properly be said, that Christ first justifieth our persons, and then our duties and actions? You hold, that the New-Covenant is not violated but by *final Unbelief*; and I suppose it to be true, if it be rightly understood. But for any thing I can see, though none be acquitted from such Violation of the New-Covenant, yet first our persons, and then our duties and actions may properly be said to be justified; that is, accepted as just, and acquitted from all Accusation brought against them, though in themselves they be not such, but that sin doth cleave unto them.

Reply.

1. I must first tell you, that I do recant these words, and the following Reasons of them, as all weak. I think it not improper to say, *God in judgment will justifie our Faith from the Accusation of unsoundness, and our obedience too.* And I think *James* and other places use the word *Justifying* to such a sense; *viz.*

against

against the Accusation that we are Unbelievers or Hypocrites, and so no performers of the Condition of the New-Covenant. And I think most Christians are more solicitous, how to answer that Accusation in Judgment (and good reason) than the Accusation of their being *sinners*, and deserving God's wrath for that in general. And the *esteeming* a *righteous action* to be *righteous*, may imply *Accusability*; and the *sentencing* it Righteous, implieth *Accusation*. And the *person* cannot be accused, but by accusing his *actions*. So much against my self.

2. Yet I maintain still the dangerousness of this speech, that our *Actions* are justified (through Christ's merits) by the Law of Works, or from the Accusation of sinfulness; and I stand to the Reasons thereof.

Now to your words: 1. And first I like not your equivocal definition of Justification, [*the acquitting of us from all sin:*] For it seems to imply, that God esteemeth us not sinners, but freeth us *à Reatu culpæ qua talis*: which is impossible. But I confess he acquitteth us from all sin, as it induceth an Obligation to punishment (as *Gataker* in the fore-cited words distinguisheth.) 2. But remember once more, that God hath made two distinct Covenants or Laws, and that each Law hath his proper Obligation; or else it is no Law: And that to acquit us from the Obligation of the Old-Law, is one Justification, consisting in Remission of sin; and the acquitting us from the Obligation of the New-Law, is not by dissolving it, and pardoning it, which is never done, but by justifying us against the Accusation of being so obliged: And this is another Justification. Pardon my so oft repeating the same thing.

3. When

3. When you ſay, [*Juſtifying is the acquitting from all ſin.*] If by [*Acquitting,*] you mean [*Pardoning,*] then you muſt extend it only to all ſin againſt the Law of Works, except that excepted by the Law of Grace; or all ſin which Believers were guilty of, but not *all ſpecies* of ſin. Not the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, not the final *non*-performance of the Conditions of the New-Covenant, which leave no remedy.

4. I am glad of your Conceſſion, that the Covenant is not violated, but by final unbelief.

5. But I am heartily ſorry that you think our *actions* as well as our *perſons* are accepted as juſt, and acquitted from all Accuſation brought againſt them (and that as to the Law of Works) though in themſelves they be not ſuch, but that ſin doth cleave unto them (as you ſay.) Againſt this Doctrine I intended that Theſis; and I confeſs my heart deteſteth it. I will bring an Accuſation againſt my own actions and yours (our Prayers, Alms, *&c.*) viz. *They are ſinful*, they are breaches of God's Law. How will you be juſtified from this Accuſation? You will not plead, *Not-guilty* I hope, and ſay, *You do not ſin!* You will ſay, God doth accept your actions as juſt. But how? Doth he take them really to be *not ſinful?* and call *evil, good?* and ſay, *ſin is no ſin?* God forbid we ſhould think it. Doth he make the *factum* to be *infectum*; or the word ſpoken to be unſaid again? *Abſit. Nam ſicut quicquid eſt, neceſſario eſt, dum eſt: ita quicquid fuit, vel præteritum eſt, neceſſariò fuit.* The Language of Divines is, it cannot be undone *ne per divinam potentiam.*

See all that I would ſay in this fully in *Ameſ. Medul.* l. 1. c. 27. §. 20, & 21.

tentiam: But is it *morally undone?* How? As I said, God doth not esteem it [*not to have been done,*] much less [*not to have been ill done:*] And as *quod fuit, necessario fuit (necessitate existentiæ, ut aiunt:) ita quod malè fuit, necessario malè fuit:* The *Reatus culpæ* therefore cannot possibly be removed or remitted; that is, the man cannot be, or justly esteemed to be, a man that [*sinned not.*] But only the *Reatus pœnæ* is taken away: God so forgiveth all our sin, that as they induce the *Debitum pœnæ*, he destroyeth them; and by dissolving the Obligation, freeth us as much from the effects (Eternal Wrath) as if they had never been committed. Is not this enough? But how you will be free from all Accusation of being a sinner, I know not.

2. Do you not fully hereby set up *Justification by the Works of the Law?* For if all your works can be justified from the Accusation of being *sinful*, or breaches of the Law, then why may not the Law justifie you (were it not only for Original sin (or perhaps you will except your sins before Conversion.)

3. Is not this the way that the Papists go? though they will not plead for Merits without Christ, yet they think that Christ hath merited the Meritoriousness of their works. So you think that Christ hath merited, that your works shall be justified from the Accusation of sinfulness.

4. And I will bring this Accusation against your works, from the Law of Works: They are not so far meritorious of Everlasting Life, as that Law requires they should be: How will you acquit them from that Accusation? Do you think Christ hath made them so meritorious?

5. Yea

5. Yea further, I will bring this Accusation against your works. They are such as deserve Eternal Damnation; yea, and for them you are obliged thereto, immediately upon the doing of them. How will you answer this Accusation? I hope not by denying it. For if you are not first *obligatus ad pœnam*, you are not capable of *Remission*. For *Remission* is nothing else but the dissolving of that Obligation. And indeed, I know nothing else that I have to say against that Accusation, but (confessing the *desert*, and that I was so obliged) to plead, that *For Christ's Satisfaction the Obligation is dissolved, by the Grant of the New-Covenant*, ut per Legem remediantem.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Justification doth imply Accusation; but the esteeming a righteous action to be as it is, doth not imply Accusation.*

Animadver.

You might also as well say, The esteeming of a righteous person to be as he is: But neither our persons nor our actions are so righteous, but that we may be accused of, and condemned for sin in them, and so without the mercy of God in Christ must be. *There's not a just man upon earth, that doth good and sinneth not.* Eccles. 7. 20. *If we say that we have no sin, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us,* &c. 1 John 1. 8, 9. *If God shall contend with us, we cannot answer him one of a thousand,* Job 9. 3. *Aaron was to bear the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel did hallow in all their holy gifts,* Exod. 28. 38. So that even in our holy things there is iniquity, which Christ the true High-Priest doth bear, that so it may not be imputed to us.

Reply.

This speech I have already reversed; and therefore will say no more about it.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. IF *it be understood in the worst sense, it will overthrow the Righteousness of Christ imputed*, &c.

Animadverf.

But not if it be understood, as I suppose it should be, That through Christ the imperfection and iniquity of our actions (though otherwise holy) is covered, and not imputed to us. This doth not overthrow, but establish Christ's Righteousness.

Reply.

Because this is but to assert the Remission of sin; and Remission is nothing but the remitting the Obligation to punishment: But if you think that the sin is remitted, or not imputed *absolutè ut peccatum*, as well as *respectivè quoad pœnam*; and that your actions may be justified against all Accusations, then I know not how the hard consequences forementioned will be avoided.

Aphorism.

Page 136. IF *God do justifie our works from any Legal Accusation (as he doth our persons) then it will follow that our works are just, and consequently that we are justified by them.*

Animadverf.

This I grant would follow, if God did justifie our works for their own sake, as being fully and perfectly righteous; but not if he do it (as he doth) for Christ's sake, pardoning and passing by the imperfection that is in them. That which hence doth follow, is not that our works are just; (*viz.* fully and perfectly as they must be, that we may be justified by them) but that they through Christ, are accepted as such; not that we are justified by our works, but that we are justified, notwithstanding the iniquity that is in them. And it seems strange unto me, how you should infer from that saying of some Divines, that we

we are justified by our works, when as the very saying it self is this, That first our persons are justified, and then our works: So that it should rather follow, That our works are justified by us, than that we are justified by our works; though indeed neither doth follow, but that both we and our works are justified by Christ, though first we, and then our works; all which (as I have shewed) is agreeable to the Scriptures.

Reply.

1. It will follow indeed, that our persons were first justified by Christ, but that afterward they may be justified by our works, when once our works themselves are all justified. You may find full Answers to this in *Chamier*, *Paræus*, *Ames.* and the rest, against the foresaid Doctrine of [Meritorionsness of Works merited by Christ.]

2. And you should have told us, Whether it be all our works that are thus justified, or but some. If all, then our sins are justified (as *David*'s Adultery, &c.) which I think you will not say. If some (as our Duties) then the justifying is nothing but the pardoning of their sinfulness: Which pardon supposeth them sinful, and it is to the *person* that the pardon is given, and not to the *work*; and the pardon only destroyeth the obligation to Punishment (commonly called Guilt) and not the evil of the work.

Aphorism.

Page 138. IF *there be any sins against the New-Covenant, which are not also against the Old; or if any sins be considered in any of their respects, as against the Gospel only, &c.*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

I ſee not how final Unbelief, or any ſin whatſoever, can be againſt the Goſpel only, and not alſo againſt the Law; ſin, as ſin, being a tranſgreſſion of the Law, 1 *John* 3.4. And there being no ſin prohibited in the Goſpel, which is not a breach of ſome Precept in the Decalogue, as your ſelf confeſſes, *p.* 147.

Reply.

1. You do not put a right name on my Aſſertion, to call it [*my Confeſſion*] unleſs you had accuſed me with contradicting it (which methinks you ſhould not.)

2. Though you be of my judgment in this, yet others are not.

3. I know ſin is a tranſgreſſion of the Law; but our Queſtion is, Of what Law? Old or New? and how far?

4. It is not ſo eaſie a matter to conceive ſuddenly how unbelief and neglect of Sacraments, *&c.* are ſins againſt the Law of Works, or the Precepts of the Decalogue, as belonging to that Law. 1. As to the Decalogue and preceptive part of the Law of Works, as it is merely in *nature*, and was delivered at the firſt, I conceive it doth command *obedience* in *general*, and ſpecifie all *natural duties*, and ſo forbid the *contrary* ſin: But it doth not *ſpecifie each particular duties* that *after* were added. I conceive that the Law of Nature, or Works, doth leave room after the firſt Inſtitution, for the adding of new-*poſitives*, without making a new-*form* of the Law as to the *Sanction*. Elſe every poſitive that *Moſes* added, ſhould have made a New-Law: So of *ſacrificing before* Moſes, *&c.* the ſence of the Law was, [Obey God in all that he now doth, or hereafter ſhall command;] and Nature ſpeaks ſo plainly. And when-ever the *Poſitive-Command* is added

added in any age, it is a fresh discovery of God's will, which *Nature* obligeth us to obey: The Obligation is as much from the *general Precept* in *Nature*, as from the *particular* superadded: And though the *general Precept*, [*Obey all God's Will*,] could not oblige to the particular till it was in being; yet when it is in being it doth oblige even to that particular, *mediante Revelatione*, which enableth us to assume, [but this is God's Will.] The same I say of the *Sanction* of the Law of Nature: It threatneth Death to *all sin*, even against a Command that was not at the first Institution in being. It saith, [Whosoever sinneth shall die.] So that it is evident that the Law of Nature in its general Precept, extendeth to all particulars that hereafter shall be revealed to be God's Will. But because I said in my Aphorism. [*That as Faith is to such an end required, so it is not specially commanded by the Law of Works.*] I must partly explain, and partly recant that. For now I think that all duties, with all their ends, are required by the Law of Nature, or that Law obligeth to them; and so to Faith, as it is a means of Remission, though this seemed strange to me heretofore. But here you must distinguish still, 1. Between the Precept, as it is a Precept, and maketh duty; and the Institution of that duty to be the *Condition* of Life. 2. Between these two Notions, [*The Law of Nature*,] and [*The Law of Works*;] for it is called, [*The Law of Works*,] in reference to the *Sanction*, as Works are made the *Condition* of Life or Death: But it is not called, The Law of Works, when you consider the *Precept* alone, though it command perfection. 3. You must distinguish between the Law of Natures obliging Man in In-

nocency, and the ſame Law as continued, obliging man ſaln; and alſo obliging man redeemed, and in hopes of Pardon and Life reſtored. The change of mans ſtate may cauſe the ſame Law to oblige him to new-duties. 4. You muſt diſtinguiſh between [The preparing and giving Chriſt, Grace, Hope, &c. and revealing them to Mankind in the Goſpel,] and, [The obliging hereupon to the duty of Believing and Receiving them.] And ſo I conclude thus for the Solution.

1. That (as is ſaid) the *Law of Nature* binding us to *Do all that God ſhall make known to be his Will*, doth oblige us to each *particular*, when it is *made known*, as it doth *generally* oblige to *obedience* before. And ſo it obligeth even to *Faith*, *Repentance*, &c.

2. The Law of Nature doth *not reveal* Chriſt, or Grace and Pardon, and Life by him; nor did it make the preparation, by giving Chriſt to ſatisfie for ſin. This is proper to the Law of Grace, to publiſh Grace and Chriſt.

3. The Law of Nature doth not make man any promiſe of Pardon, Juſtification and Salvation, if he repent and believe.

4. The Law of Nature did not oblige man in Innocency to repent, or return to God, or believe in Chriſt. For there was not the matter of, or capacity in us, for ſuch an Obligation.

5. But as ſoon as ever Man was ſaln, (even before Chriſt was promiſed) the Law of Nature obliged ſaln Man to *repent* and *return* to God. But it gave him no hope of pardon on his Repentance: So that it would have been but a deſpairing Repentance. Yet hereby it is apparent, that the Law of Nature maketh us *new-duties*, as our caſe changeth;

and

and some duties proper to *faln Man*, which to the *Innocent* it made not.

6. Though the Law of Nature neither *give* nor *reveal* Christ, Hope, Pardon, and restored Life, yet when God by Grace hath redeemed us, and given us up to Christ, and revealed Him, and Hope, and Life by him, then the Law of Nature commandeth us to believe God's Revelation, and accept God's gracious offer, and repent and return, and love him that bought us, and be thankful, &c. Who feeleth not in himself, that Nature and common Reason obligeth to, or requireth this on the foresaid suppositions? So much of the Precept of Natures Law.

7. The Law of Nature continueth to pronounce Death due to every sin, and the greatest punishment due to the greatest sins. And therefore by that Law, Death is due to Unbelief; yea, a far sorer punishment than was due to ordinary sins, in that it hath such aggravations. And though it condemned Man for the first sin, and provided him no remedy, yet a remedy being *aliunde* provided, it further condemneth him if he reject it.

8. Though the form of the Law of Works was not altered by God; yet the Obligation (as it were) of the *promissory* or *premiant* part is ceased, upon Man's first sin, through the utter incapacity of Man to receive it. For it promised Life only to the perfect or *innocent*; and the first sin made us all *nocent*, and unmeet subjects. And so Divines use to say, That the Law as *a Covenant* is dissolved; not that the *whole Sanction* is dissolved, but *per cessationem*, the promissory part is void, or the Promiser disobliged by us.

9. That therefore which is proper to the New-Law is, that it, 1. Be built on a new foundation, *viz.* Redemption; and ſo the Legiſlator is *Deus-Redemptor*, and not only *Deus-Naturæ, vel Deus-Creator* as ſuch. 2. That it reveal Chriſt, and his Sacrifice, and Hope, Pardon and Life, *&c.* 3. That it promiſe and give all theſe. 4. That it *inſtitute the Condition* on which they ſhall be given, or be ours. All theſe the Law of Nature meddleth not in; though when the *Condition* is inſtituted, it obligeth us not only in general to obey, but in ſpecial to obey, and uſe it to theſe ends appointed.

10. Yet no man muſt think, that *all* the *New-Law* conſiſteth in theſe only, and that the *Precept* and *Threatning* are no true parts of the New-Law, becauſe they are common with the Old: For even theſe are ſtill true parts of it. Even as the earth that man's body was made of, ceaſed not to be truly earth when it was made man, nor ceaſeth to be a proper or eſſential part of man, becauſe it is earth. Or as a cup of water taken out of the River, and made Beer, ceaſeth not to be water, nor yet can be denied to be Beer. Only it ceaſeth to be mere or common water, as our bodies do to be mere common earth. So here the preceptive part of the Law of Nature, is comprehenſive of the Law of Grace, and all Laws that ever will be (ſuppoſing thoſe alterations *in rerum Natura* which lay the grounds:) But yet, as the Specification of the Covenants or Laws, is (as *Camero* oft, and others) from the *Condition* and *Sanction*, and ſo the New-Law is ſpecified from thence: So it hence aſſumeth into its nature, even that which is part of the Law of Nature. Only as man's body is now no *common earth*,

ſo

so the Precepts of *Faith*, *Repentance*, &c. as tending to recovery, are not *common Legal Precepts*; But may be considered as belonging to the Law of Grace, and also to the Law of Nature. So that as man's Soul is specifically distinct from earth, and his Body in it self not so, but as *pars à toto*; but yet is made an essential part of man: So the *preceptive* part of the Law of Grace, is distinct from the Law of Nature, but as *pars à toto*; and yet is made an essential part of that Law, whose *Promise* and Institution of a *Condition qua talis*, is *specifically* distinct from the Law of Nature; and from the whole is denominated as specifically distinct.

And hence it is that the Law of Christ is oftner called, a *Testament*, *Covenant*, *Gospel*, &c. than a Law: Which hath occasioned the *Lutheran* Divines (some of them) against Scripture, and all Antiquity, to deny it to be properly a Law, and confine its whole nature to the foresaid *proper parts*, which *in specie* differ from the Old. It must be known, that as the Righteousness of Faith (in it self, as the Condition of the New-Law) is but *subservient* to *Christ's Righteousness*, and required for it; so the *New-Law* is a *subservient Law* to the *Law of Nature*, being but *Lex remedians*, to destroy the Obligation of the Old (*ad pœnam*) and conduce to the attaining of its ends.

And so much for explication of my thoughts on this point; which I write to satisfie my self as I go on in reviewing my Writings. I think the right stating, and clear apprehension of this point (of the difference between the Law and Gospel, and how far the Law of Works is abrogated) to be of greater moment and difficulty by far, than your

Animadversions take notice of; or than any thing (as to difficulty) that you deal with, as far as I remember.

The sum of all is, That the *promissory* part of the *Law of Works* doth not oblige, but is destroyed, not by an *Abrogation*, but *Cessation*, *cessante materia vel capacitate subjecti*: But the *Precept* ceaseth not, (except some Positives, which may be added or taken away without alteration in the nature of the Law;) nor the *Threatning* (because *nec abrogatur, nec cessat materia*:) That the *Precept* of the Law of Grace is now under the general Precept of the Law of Nature. Yet is it not fit to call Faith and Repentance, and Sacraments, &c. [*Precepts of the Law of Nature*,] without Explication; because they have now a *super*-added new-form, by conjunction with the Doctrine and Promise of Grace (as the water hath a new-form by commixtion, when it is made Beer; and the Body of man, when of earth it was made man, and yet retaineth the form of water and earth still: But the denomination must follow the new *super*-added form.) And so the Denomination of Faith and Repentance must be from the *super*-added form, and they must be called, [*Parts of the New-Law.*] Yet the whole bulk of the Precepts of the Law of Nature, remain in conjunction with the Threatnings of that Law: But the Promise of the New-Law is a remedy at hand to dissolve it. And the Threat of the New-Law hath in it somewhat common to it with the Old; (*viz.* The Institution of the dueness of Punishment to Impenitency and Unbelief, proportioned to their nature) and something proper to the New-Law; *viz.* In the Negative, not to institute the penalty due to each

each particular ſin; Poſitively, to make its Obligation to Puniſhment for final Unbelief and Impenitency, to be remedileſs, and irreverſible, and peremptory, determining not only *de Debito* (as the firſt Law doth, and all Laws do;) but alſo by Prediction *de Eventu* which is a thing *ſuper*-added to the *ſtrict* nature of a Law as ſuch. Beſides, that it incorporateth the common part of the Threat alſo into its own body, and maketh it eſſential to it ſelf; *viz.* the *Debitum non-liberationis, & majoris pœnæ.*

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. *FOr to all that Unbelief, and other ſins of the godly which are forgiven, the Goſpel doth no where threaten death.*

Animadverſ.

Not ſo indeed threaten death, as not withal to offer life upon Condition of repenting and believing: Which alſo the Goſpel doth even to the ungodly, *Acts* 3. 19. & 13. 38,39. But the Goſpel eſtabliſhing, and not repealing the Moral Law (as you confeſs, *pag.* 154.) doth threaten death to all Unbelief, and to all ſin, that ſo the Grace and Mercy offered to men in the Goſpel, may be accepted of them.

Reply.

The [Moral Law] is uſually taken for the mere Preceptive part of the Law of Nature, as abſolutely conſidered without the Sanction: And ſo the ſame thing which is the Law of Nature, may be alſo the directive or preceptive part of the Law of Grace: (Though I am unſatisfied, whether it be fit to ſay, The Law of Chriſt doth conſtitute that duty a-new, and take in the Moral Law as part of it ſelf; or only ſuppoſe it, and make uſe of it.) But you

here take the [Moral Law] for the Precept, as conjunct with the Threatning (else you would not say, it threateneth death:) But so I take it to be no true part of the New-Law, though not dissolved or abrogated by it. Else I think we shall make the first Law of Nature, and Christ's Law of Grace all one.

Aphorism.

Page 163. *But the Covenant-Conditions are not broken, when-ever the Precept of the Gospel is transgressed, or the Covenant neglected, except it be final.*

Animadvers.

This seems more accurate than solid. For may not the Conditions of the Covenant be broken, though they be not finally broken? The Conditions of the New-Covenant are, to repent and believe. Now if they to whom the New-Covenant is tendered, be impenitent and unbelieving; so long as they are so, they break the Conditions of the New-Covenant, whether it be only for a time, or to the end. Indeed if the Covenant-Conditions be at length performed, they are not absolutely broken; but yet broken they are, whilst they are not performed, and yet ought to be performed. The New-Covenant you grant, may be neglected; but it is not neglected, if the Conditions of it be performed: And to distinguish between not-performing the Conditions of the Covenant, when it is tendered, and breaking the Conditions of it; I think is not sound.

Reply.

1. You seem (by your silence) to grant the main thing I here intend; viz. *Thes.* 35. That *Christ died not to satisfie for the Violation of the Covenant of Grace, but of Works only.*

2. I did explain what I meant by [*Violating the Conditions,*] in the last words of the *Thesis*, [*So as that the offender should fall under the Threat*]: But more fully in the Appendix.

3. By

3. By [*the Threatning*,] I mean not [*every discovery of an immiuent danger*;] but that proper act of the Law, which is *obligare ad pœnam*.

4. I still confess, that for *Unbelief* and *Impenitency*, men remain *obligati ad pœnam per Legem naturæ*, till they believe, and so that Obligation be dissolved.

5. But still I deny it, as to the proper Obligation of the New-Law: For I conceive that is peremptory, remediless and undissolvable. And therefore I think it both sound and necessary to distinguish between the proper *Violation* of the Covenant, and the *temporary non-performance* of the Conditions. Yet I resolve not to contend about the *Word* or *Name*: If you think the one is as *properly* to be called a *Violation* as the other, and I think not, this is a matter of no great moment. But as to the thing intended by that word, I say, that *Unbelief not final*, is *no such Violation* of the New-Law, as to make us *obligati ad pœnam hujus Legis propriam*, or that *this Law* should oblige us to punishment. For else we must say, that Christ came to satisfie his own Law, and be a Mediator between himself, as Mediator, and sinners, which I am loth to say. Indeed the Gospel-Covenant doth *non-liberare*, while men continue their unbelief. But I conceive it doth not *obligare ad pœnam propriè*, *viz. ad non-liberationem & ad pœnam majorem*, but for final *non*-performance. For if it do, it is either *absolutely*, or *conditionally*: Not *absolutely* (which you here confess;) for then there were *no remedy*: For the *absolute Threat* of the New-Law is *irrevocable* and *remediless*. And if but *conditionally*, then it is no Obligation: For it were no Condition, if it suspend not the Act of the Law. If a King say to a company of imprisoned Murtherers,

therers, He that will promise a new-life shall be pardoned; and he that will not, shall not be pardoned, but at the Assizes suffer a double torment. Here the Condition of present Liberation indeed is present, promising amendment; and for want of present promising, he shall want present Liberation. But the Condition of Liberation or Condemnation at the Assizes, is promising any time between this and then. And so here: The Gospel doth not *remediare*, *dissolve* the Laws Obligation, as long as we continue impenitent. But it obligeth us not to Condemnation at Judgment, but upon final Unbelief. If yet any say, that this present *non-Liberation* is *pœna novæ Legis*, and so far it may be said *obligare*: Though I should rather say, it doth *non dissolvere obligationem*, yet I shall confess, that this *non-Liberation* may in some sort be called *pœna*, and I will not stick at this. Only remember that this is nothing to the Obligation, to *sentential Condemnation de futuro*, which we speak of. 2. And that Christ need not die for this: For this *non-liberatio dum non credo*, is a penalty that I bear my self (*non enim liberor*;) and therefore Christ need not bear it for me.

But I come so lately from a fuller handling this point with another, that I must say no more of it now.

Aphorism.

Page 164. THE Condition is, *Whosoever believeth shall be saved, not limiting it to a particular season.*

Anim-

Animadvers.

It's true: He only shall be damned as a Transgressor of the New-Covenant, who is a final Unbeliever; yet all the time that any refuse to believe, they are liable to Damnation, as transgressing all that time the New-Covenant, and breaking the Condition of it.

Reply.

If by [*Lyable*,] you mean [*actually obliged to Damnation*,] I deny it. If you mean, they are in *danger* of it, because God may cut them off when he will; or that supposing their Unbelief to be final, they would be obliged; or that there wants nothing but the finality to oblige them; or that they are obliged even for that sin, to death *per Legem naturæ*, and are *non liberati per Legem gratiæ*, I grant all this.

Aphorism.

Page 165. *Because the punishment which naturally and implicitely is due to them, is not so much as threatned in this gentle Covenant*, &c.

Animadvers.

Perhaps this place is mis-printed: Otherwise I do not see how these words make for the proof of that which went before; viz. [The sins of Believers against the Gospel-Precepts have need of pardon, and are properly said to be pardoned, in reference to their deserved punishment.] Is Punishment therefore deserved, because it is not threatened? Or do you mean (as perhaps you do) by those words, [which is naturally and implicitely due to them,] that Punishment is deserved, but not threatned? But if Punishment be not threatned, there seems no need of pardon. Because what need is there to fear that which is not threatned? As what ground is there to hope for that which is not promised? Somewhere before your self says, What God doth not threaten, we need not fear.

Reply.

Reply.

The miſ-printing is, that there ſhould have been a Parentheſis to encloſe ſix lines, from [1. *Both.*] till [*becauſe* :] And ſo the word [*Properly*] I intended only to joyn with the ſecond Section; and intended the firſt as *improperly*, called Pardon, arguing, not as you ſuppoſe, [It is not threatned, therefore not deſerved;] but thus, [*It was threatened by the Old-Law*, and is *not ſo much as threatned* by *the New*; therefore *it may improperly* be *ſaid to be remitted.*]

Aphoriſm.

Page 173. *ACts have not the reſpect of an Adjunct to its Subject, but of an Effect to its Cauſe.*

Animadverſ.

Every Act is an accident, and therefore muſt have a ſubject: for it cannot ſubſiſt by it ſelf. And whereas tranſient Acts are ſubjected in the Patient, immanent Acts are ſubjected in the Agent, becauſe here the Agent is alſo the Patient.

Reply.

Becauſe I will not vainly enter into a Logical Diſpute with you, I will only anſwer you in the words of *Schibler*, *Metaphyſ.* l. 2. c. 10. *Art.* 4. *Tom.* 3. *punct.* 1, 2. §. 51. 54, 55. *Accidens eſt in alio loquendo per* κατάχρησιν. *Omne ſcil. accidens eſt in alio ſenſu negativo quatenus non habet eſſe ἀνυποστατον, ſive per ſe ſubſiſtens. Alias autem loquendo de generalia eſſentia accidentis, non eſt ea inhærendo, ſi rigoroſe loquamur; ſed in eo, quod id quod accidens eſt, afficit ſubſtantiam extra-eſſentialiter, ſive extra eſſentiam, aut rationem ejus exiſtendo, &c. vid. ultra.* Et *n.* 54. *Quod ad actionem immanentem attinet, dicitur immanens ab immanendo quia in agente manet.*

Exiſtimo

Existimo tamen eam non esse intelligendam positivè sed negativè. Nempè actio immanens qua talis est in agente hoc sensu, quia non transit ad patiens. In ipso autem agente non est per modum adjuncti, sed simpliciter ad ipsum comparatur ut ad causam. Unde hæc propositio, homo intelligit vel disputat, non est ut adjuncti de subjecto, sed ut effecti de causa: Et patet. Nam actio transiens nullum habet subjectum, ne quidem ipsum patiens, ut visum est: ergo etiam actio Immanens à fortiori non postulat subjectum. Consequentia firma est: quia actio transiens magis est ex subjecto, & magis postulat subjectum, quam actio immanens. Sed actio transiens in esse actionis nullum habet subjectum ut visum est, ergo idem à fortiore est in actione immanente. Et confirmatur, quod actio ut sic, non dicit nisi egressum à virtute activa alicujus agentis. Egressus autem opponitur τῷ esse in. Et hinc relinquitur, generatim loquendo de actione ut sic, eam non postulare subjectum, &c. I think it fitter to say, *Actio est agentis*, than *Actio est in agente*. Yet I confess my self in doubt about *Scotus* Doctrine, that [*Immanent Acts in their perfection, are not in the predicament of Action, but of Quality*:] And if that be so, you may well say they are *in Agente ut subjecto*.

Aphorism.

Page 174. *But grant that all God's immanent Acts are eternal (which I think is quite beyond our understanding to know,) &c.*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

Immanent acts (as that very word it ſelf doth ſhew) abiding in the agent (for therefore they are called immanent,) Either God's immanent Acts muſt be eternal, or there muſt be ſomething in God which is but temporal: Whereas *quicquid eſt in Deo eſt Deus*: otherwiſe he ſhould not be a moſt pure and ſimple Eſſence, as he is.

Reply.

I uſe to ſpeak as you do; and thus oppoſe thoſe that think otherwiſe: But let me profeſs, it is but my *Opinion*, and not my *Faith*. I have no ſuch clear knowledg of the Divine Eſſence, as peremptorily to conclude theſe things as certain. I know God is eternal, and that he is perfect: But whether his perfection lye, in having no Acts but his Eſſence; or whether God do *agere* at all; or whether his Acts have extrinſick objects; or whether thoſe Acts which have ſuch extrinſick objects, are properly immanent, as thoſe are whoſe object is God himſelf, *&c.* I dare not conclude as certain, though I think as you. Oh how little know I of God's Eſſence!

Aphoriſm.

Page 175. *Relations are but mere* entia Rationis.

Animadverſ.

Why then is Relation put among the Predicaments? Is there not a *real Relation* betwixt the Father and the Son? a Relation which hath its being in Nature, and not in mans intellect only?

Reply.

Reply.

I am so far from believing *all* the Predicaments to be *real Beings*, that I doubt whether *any two* of them wholly are so, as much as *Carpenter* did. Yet I take them to be as *Burgersdicius* speaks, *aliquid inter nihil & ens reale*: And I think that *Scotus* his *formalitates* or *modi*, and *ens rationis*, contain much that now commonly goes under another Name. I think the *subjectum & fundamentum Relationis*, is sometimes *quid reale* (usually, but *quid modale* is the *fundamentum*.) I think that the comparing or collating act of understanding is not a mere fiction, or false, when it makes Relation. But whether when the *Foundation* is laid, the Fabrication of the Essence of the Relation *ut sic*, be not by the Intellect, is my question. If *Peccatum* be but *ens rationis* (which is accounted a *real Relation* of Disconformity to the Rule) as is ordinarily said: And if *veritas* be but *ens rationis* (as *Durandus* saith) why may I not say so of others? Relation-terms are as properly ascribed to God, as any terms of Humane Language, I think. But was God from *Eternity* a *Creator?* If yea, then there was a Creature, or a Relation without a correlate. If no; then it begun in time. If so, then if it were any real Being (remember your last arguing) it must be God him-

Herebr. saith, *Quare inepte dicitur & falsò, Relationes more accidentium cæterorum inesse subjectis, cum subjecto tantum modo attribuantur. Voces quippè Relativæ non significant aliud, quod subjecto proprie ac per se inest, sed tantum declarant quomodo subjectum se habeat ad terminum*, &c. And he saith, That Relation is *Medium inter ens reale & nihil, non participationis sed negationis*: Of which there are also other sorts, *Disp. Phil. 5. page* 178, 184.

himſelf, and ſo eternal, or God not eternal. But I am reſolved not to diſpute this with you: Only that Relation is not *verè ens* (of which I am more confident, than what it is) ſave me the labour of tranſcribing, and read *Burgerſdicius*, l. 1. c. 5. & c. 6. and *Hereboord*, *Diſp. Phil.* 5. per tot. (I will not refer you to *Carpenter*) *vid. & quid de Relat. Rationis dicit Twiſſus Vind. Grat. l. 2. part. 1. §. 13. pag. (minor. volun.)* 208. *præcipue ex Vaſquio.*

Aphoriſm.

Page 194. *THat ſaying of our Divines, that* [Juſtification is perfected at firſt, and admits of no degrees,] *muſt be underſtood thus; That each of thoſe Acts which we call Juſtification, are in their own kind perfect at once; and that our Righteouſneſs is perfect, and admits of no degrees: But yet, as the former Acts called* [*Juſtification*] *do not fully and in all reſpects procure our freedom, ſo they may be ſaid to be imperfect, and but degrees toward our full and perfect Juſtification at the laſt Judgment.*

Animadverſ.

Properly none can be more or leſs juſtified, becauſe he that is juſtified is freed from all Condemnation, *Rom.* 8. 1. & 33. Juſtification therefore at the laſt Judgment, is not a more full Juſtification, but only a Juſtification more fully made manifeſt. Neither do I ſee how you ſhould deny, that our Juſtification here is perfect, ſo as to procure full and perfect freedom, *viz.* from Condemnation, if (as you grant) our Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified be perfect: And ſo indeed it is, though that Righteouſneſs be not (as you ſuppoſe) a Righteouſneſs of our own within us, but only the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt through faith imputed to us.

Reply

Reply.

1. *Negatur sequela.* One man may be more perfectly freed from *all Condemnation* than another, though both be freed *from all.* It is not only the *Terminus à quo* that is to be considered, but the degree of the Liberation therefrom. One man may be freed from Condemnation only *quoad Donationem & Constitutionem Legis*, and another also *quoad sententiam judicis.*

2. Justification also freeth *against Accusation*, as the *means*, as well as *from Condemnation, the end:* And we are not yet freed against *all Accusation.*

3. And for the Antecedent, we must distinguish of the word [*freed from:*] either you mean, that our Liberation is *compleated* (which I deny;) or that it is so effectually begun, that it shall certainly be perfected (which serves not your turn.) The Apostle only saith, [*There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ:*] But as this Text doth not say, [*There shall be none,*] nor promise that they shall never be out of Christ again (though I think others do;) so it saith not that their deliverance from future Condemnation (or which would else be future) is perfected. They are not now under Condemnation, nor ever shall be; (Is not that all you can hence gather?) and yet they would be to morrow condemned, if no more were done than is done. I will be bold to tell you, how far short you are yet from Perfection, even in this matter of Justification.

1. There is a great deal of guilt which will lye on you, from which you are not yet justified *ne quidem constitutivè.* You *will sin* every day, hour and moment; Will you need no Justification from the guilt of these sins? They will condemn you, if

you have none. Perhaps a man may have the guilt of ten times more sins to be freed from after his first Justification, than before. If Justification be the same with *Remission of sin* (as very many say, and I know no real difference, as to *constitutive Justification*;) then sure you have need of a *particular Justification* upon the renewal of sin, as well as of a *particular Remission*, besides the *universal Justification* and *Remission* foregoing: Yea, though they be not the same, yet being so near akin, this will follow. I suppose you will not say, sin is *remitted before committed*; or guilt removed before it is guilt! If you fly to *Amesius*, [*Virtualiter & in subjecto,*] *Medul. l. 1. c. 27. § 24.* that is sure less than *Actualiter & in se* (and indeed is not *Remission*;) and therefore not perfect.

2. Your Justification either is yet only *constitutive*, and not *per sententiam judicis*, or else only *quoad sententiam aliquam minus publicam; & non ab omnibus (scil. futuris) peccatis:* Whereas your Justification will be *per sententiam judicis*, at that great day, and that from all sin. How could the Apostle say, [*That your sins may be blotted out, when the time of refreshing comes*, &c. Acts 3. 19.] if no more be done then to it than now?

3. Our present Justification freeth us not from God's *Paternal Sentence, and castigatory punishment*; but our future Justification will.

4. The continuance of Justification while we are here, is but *conditional*, and *de futuro* neither *absolute* nor *actual*. And a *conditional* Justification is not so much as an absolute. That it is but *conditional*, is evident from the full tenor of the Covenant: It saith not, [*He that believeth once, shall be*

fa-

for ever justified; but, [*He that believeth, is or shall be justified*;] that is, as long as he believeth.

If you say, [*It is certain they shall believe.*]

I answer, That altereth not the tenor of the Promise: Predestination giveth not Legal Right. It was *certain, vel futurum ab æterno*, that you should believe and persevere; and yet you were not therefore justified. And God only justifieth us *pro præsenti*, and not *pro futuro*. And then it is evident, that conditional Justification is not actual, nor true Justification: for *conditionale nihil ponit, donec præstetur conditio*. Where there is much means to be used, and conditions yet to be performed, for the Continuation and Consummation of our Justification, there it is not yet continued or consummate; nor that person so perfect as to Justification, as he that is past all conditions and means, and so hath his Justification consummate, and is in his immutable state. That much means is yet to be used to this end, that our Justification may be continued and consummate, and sentential Justification and Judgment added, if I thought I needed, I could easily and fully prove. Both Prayer, Obedience, *&c.* are means to that end: (of which more toward the end.) And that Conditions are yet to be performed to that end, I will argue on the common Principles (lest you deny Repentance or Obedience to be such Conditions.) If it be not only the first act of Faith by which men are justified, then their Justification is not so consummate at the first, but that they are still to be justified every day. But it is not only the first act of Faith by which men are justified; therefore, *&c.*

For the Antecedent; As it were a wild fancy to exclude all the Faith of a man's life, except the first

act; so *Abraham*'s example, as mentioned by the Apostle, contradicteth it expresly. And for the Consequence, If following acts of Faith justifie, either by concurring to our first Justification, or by the continuing our universal Justification, and procuring the daily addition of particular Justification and Remission: But it cannot be by concurring to our first Justification; for it is against Scripture and Reason, that I was justified twenty years ago, by believing to day. It is therefore by continuing our universal Justification, and procuring the addition of daily particular Justification: And all this by way of Condition. Now though Perseverance add nothing *ad rei naturam*, yet it is a moral Addition, which must have its Cause; and therefore such Promises are made to *Waiting*, *Patience*, *Perseverance*, &c. And that man that must have all these Conditions yet to perform, that he may be continuedly and consummately justified, is not in so perfect and full a sense justified, as he that hath done all. I still profess, that every sort or act of Justification is perfect in its kind, and as to its proper end; but not of the *perfectest kind*, nor absolutely perfect. He that is in the beginning of the fight, unwounded and safe, is as perfectly safe *quoad naturam rei*, as he that hath gone through all the rest of the dangers, and suffered twenty more particular charges, and overcome all: But he is not safe in so perfect a sense (though you suppose him by a spirit of Prophecy to be sure to scape;) because he hath yet much hazard and labour to go through for the attaining of his safety: And yet we may say as Paul, *If these abide not in the ship, ye cannot be saved.* The end is not perfectly enjoyed, while so many

means

means are yet to be used for it. I refer you to Mr. *Burgeß* of Justification, *Lect.* 29. which is wholly to prove the point I insist on.

5. There is yet the *solemnizing* of all wanting: And a Marriage not-solemnized is not all so perfect as that which is.

But the main thing that I stand on is, that both Christ's Apologetical Justification of us *qua Advocatus vel Patronus*, and his *sentential publick Justification* at Judgment, do not only differ from ours now; but so much differ, that I think we should scarce be called *justified now*, but in Relation to the Justification then.

But you think otherwise, that [*it is not a more full Justification, but a Justification more fully made manifest.*] Many men, many minds: I have sore contest with Mr. *L.* and all will not convince him, that *any but sentential* is properly *Justification*: And that which I call *Constitutive, & in sensu Legis*, is but *Right to Justification*. I easily yield to you, that the Law or Grant of Grace doth its own work perfectly, in *constitutive Justification*. But yet I make no doubt to affirm, that though Justification *constitutive* be *proper Justification*; yet the word is more commonly used by Lawyers and Protestant Divines, for *Justification by sentence*: And so the Law justifieth but *virtually*, and not *properly* and *actually* at all (as to this *sentential Justification.*) To absolve from a Crime and Penalty, and *adjudicare præmium, contra actoris accusationem*, is the most full, perfect Justification of all. And it's exceeding strange, that you should think it nothing but a Justification made manifest, when it is another sort of Justification *toto cœlo*, different from *constitutive*:

Or if you mean, it is but a fuller Manifestation of some *Sentential Justification*, which we have now by Faith; you should have said so, and should shew what *that Sentence* is, *& in quo foro? per quem judicem? & quinam sint actus judiciales? & cujus generis sit decisio absolutoria?* when I had brought that so far into question. But I conceive there is more in the *Sentence of the Judg*, than *Manifestation*. *Sententia Judicis est pars decisionis litis, quæ est causæ controversæ per judicem determinatio*: Without it there is ordinarily no full *jus in re & possessio* of the Priviledge or Reward in question: It is more fully ours after the Judgment than before. Nor is there a perfect *Liberation* from the Crime and Penalty which we are charged to be guilty of: *Hæc enim pertinent ad sententiæ executionem, quæ sententiam ipsam præsupponit. Decretum est pars secunda judicii. Decernere est post causæ cognitionem statuere. Statuere est quid majus quam manifestare. Manifestant testes, evidentiæ, ipse reus, &c. Sed non statuunt, decernunt, nec per sententiam absolvunt.* That Adjudication of everlasting Reward or Punishment at the Judgment-day, will be more than mere Manifestation: It will be the most full, proper, perfect Justification which then we shall receive; which I think Scripture more respecteth in this point, than some observe; and I think it is in order to that great Justification that our present Justification obtains the name.

Again, I would argue thus: If Justification be opposed to Condemnation, and the Condemnation by publick Sentence be quite different in kind from Condemnation now *in Law* (or any sentential Condemnation that I know of) then Justification by

publick

publick Sentence, is as different from Justification in Law: But the former is true; therefore so is the latter. I say therefore as *Camero*, Prælect. de Verbo Dei, pag. 462. (operum fol.) [*Authoritas judicis propria jus facit; Itaq; judicis sententia effectiva potius est quam declarativa.*]

But suppose the Sentence did only *declare:* It may yet be as true and proper a kind of Justification as *constitutive*; if we consider, that it is not the Declaration of a private person, but of the Supreme Judg: And a *Declaration* in opposition to *Accusation (ne succedat)* and *Condemnation (ne fit;)* and which must determine the case finally, Whether we shall be in Heaven or Hell.

But you say, [*You see not how I can deny our Justification to be perfect, when I say our Righteousness is perfect.*]

I answer you by two necessary distinctions:

1. I deny not but our *constitutive Justification* is *perfect*; and that's all that can be gathered from the perfection of our Righteousness. But I deny that our *constitutive Justification* is the *most perfecting, compleat sort of Justification*; or yet that our *sentential Justification* is *now perfect*.

2. You must distinguish of *Perfection*, as it respecteth the *present subject*, and as the same thing *materially* is compared to *another subject*, or to the *future state* of that subject: And so I say, that we are *perfectly justified constitutivè* the first day we believe, considering it as the *present Righteousness* of us in that present state: And yet that is not *materially* so perfect a Justification, as that which we have of the same kind at our death: For we are then justified from millions of sins more than be-

fore, and all the Conditions are performed. If therefore we had but the same Justification materially at death, which we had at our first believing, that is, were justified from no more sins, it would be no perfect Justification to us, but a partial and particular one. A Childs shooe is meet for his foot, and a mans is no more: But the same shooe which was meet for him when he was a Child, will not be meet when he is a man: Yea, if it be the skin on his foot, it must grow as he grows, or it will not be meet; and yet *Meetness* formally is one and the same thing. This is it that I told you before, that the matter of our Righteousness; *viz.* Our gracious inclinations and actions (commonly called Holiness) hath degrees, though Righteousness as such, hath none.

Aphorism.

Page 211. IF *we are not one real person with Christ, then one what?*

Animadvers.

The Apostle saith, *He that is joyned to the Lord, is one spirit*, 1 Cor. 6. 17. *i. e.* he is spiritually one with Christ, as being partaker of Christ's Spirit, and thereby united to him, and made one with him. And this I think you mean, when you say, that we are his Body Mystical, but not Natural.

Reply.

Unio hæc est spiritualis illa Relatio *hominum ad Christum qua jus acquirunt ad omnes illas benedictiones quæ in ipso præparantur.* Jo. 3. 12. & 3. 24 *Amesius Medul.* l. 1. c. 26. §. 2.

This is mere Ambiguity, and no resolution of the Question. The Question is, Whether he that is spiritually one with him, or one Spirit with him, be one *Spirit essentially*, or *one personally*, *in sensu physico*; or only one person *in sensu morali vel politico*,

as

as a *Corporation* and their *Bailiff*, a *City* and their *Mayor*, a *Republick* and their *Sovereign*, are one Body? or, Whether Union be largely taken for Conjunction? But I am willing to let this Myſtery paſs with a reverend admiration and acknowledgment of my ignorance, rather than raſhly to determine in the dark: Only I reſolve to keep off from their errour, that tell us we are deified, or made one eſſence or perſon with Chriſt properly. I am afraid of ſoaring too high in proud aſpiring ſtrains, in my thoughts of our Union with Chriſt, and our participation of the Divine Nature; and leſt while I ſeek to be more than man, I become leſs; knowing that aſpiring to be as God, is the way to be a Devil. *Camero* in *Prælect.* hath ſaid more of this point of Union, than any I know; but he extendeth the ſenſe of [*Union*] ſomewhat far.

Aphoriſm.

Page 221. *BUt though Faith be not the Inſtrument of Juſtification, may it not be called, the Inſtrument of receiving Chriſt?*

Animadverſ.

I think they mean ſo, and no more, who call Faith the Inſtrument of our Juſtification, becauſe by Faith we receive Chriſt, by whom we are juſtified.

Reply.

I commend your charitable Interpretation: But the vehement aſſerting and arguing for Faiths proper, direct Inſtrumentality in juſtifying, which from multitudes I have heard, and which in multitudes I have read, forbiddeth me ſo to judg. And if it were ſo, their ſpeech is improper.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 222. *The act of Faith (which is it that justifieth) is our actual receiving of Christ, and therefore cannot be the Instrument of receiving.*

Animadverſ.

1. The act of Faith doth juſtifie, not in reſpect of it ſelf as it is our act, though ſo it be requiſite, but in reſpect of its *Object*, *viz.* Chriſt; whom Faith acting, doth receive, even as it is the gift that doth enrich, though not except it be received.

2. The act of the hand is the actual receiving a gift; Is not the hand therefore the Inſtrument whereby the gift is received? and conſequently whereby one is enriched?

Yet I ſhall not be unwilling to yield unto you, that to ſpeak exactly, Faith may better be called a Condition, than an Inſtrument of our Juſtification. But becauſe it is as a hand to receive Chriſt (for to receive him, and to believe in him are the ſame, *John* 1. 12.) and the hand is ὄργανον ὀργάνων, a prime Inſtrument: therefore (I conceive it is) that Faith is uſually called an Inſtrument. Beſides, your ſelf obſerves, *page* 211. that ſome ſo extend the uſe of the word [*Inſtrument*,] as that any thing almoſt may be called an Inſtrument, *viz.* which is requiſite, but yet is leſs principal in the action.

Reply.

1. We are not juſtified by the act of Faith abſolutely, or as the *meritorious Cauſe*, or the *matter* of our principal Legal Righteouſneſs; if that be it that you mean by, [*in reſpect of it ſelf*:] Nor are we juſtified by *Chriſt* as a *Performer of the Goſpel-Conditions for us*, or a *Satisfier* for *final non-performance*. *Chriſt* hath his *own work*, and *Faith* hath *its own* office in our Juſtification. We are juſtified *by Faith it ſelf*, as the *Condition*, and not ſo by Chriſt.

Here I give you notice, that though the *act* of Faith be moſt directly the Condition, yet I think the

the *habit* is so intimately included in the true, serious, intense act, and is so little different in nature from it, that even the *habit* may be also called the *Condition*, and we be said to be justified by it. And indeed I think that the Scripture, when it speaks of being *justified by Faith*, doth in the word [*Faith*] include both *act and habit*. And I am conceited, that they less differ in their nature (*an act and an habit of the Soul*) than many Philosophers think: especially this would be evident, if *Scotus* were in the right, that *intellectio & volitio* compleated, which we call *immanent Acts*, are not in the predicament of *Action*, but of *Quality*, in the same *species* as *Habits*: Or if some others opinion be true, that *Habits* are but in the intellect the *Species* or Images deeply imprinted, and in the Will either none (besides the intellectual) or only a continued action, though sometimes so imperfect and obscure, that it is not perceived or felt, as being less vigorous and express than other actions which then are felt. Sure I am, if other men be no wiser than I, their apprehensions of the true nature of *Habits*, with their difference from *Powers* and *Acts*, is not so clear as may embolden a man with confidence, to reject *Habits* from being the *Condition*, and so having a hand with the *act* in our Justification. And whether it can truly be said, that the Habit is required only for the act, and not for it self, I cannot tell: I rather think otherwise. This I write, partly in Explication, and partly in Recantation of some things before delivered on this point, *Thes.* 57. which I think my self bound to do on more through Consideration.

2. In

2. In your second note: 1. You quite forget what you were to prove: It was not that the *Habit* of Faith is the Instrument, but the *Act*: For that is the common Doctrine, and that which I was there opposing. The *act* of the *Hand*, and and not the *Hand*, is it that you should prove the Instrument. You will not get all to confess, that the *act* of Faith is not the Instrument of receiving Christ, nor yet of Justification. 2. And if the *Habit* were granted to be the Instrument of receiving Christ, yet could it with no fitness be said, in the sense of our Divines, that Faith justifieth as an *Instrument*, because they say, It is not the *habit* of Faith that justifieth, but the *act*: And you say, It is not the *Act* that is the Instrument, but the *Habit*; therefore it plainly follows, that (according to this Doctrine) Faith cannot justifie as an Instrument. 3. I do not think that the *Habit* is properly the Souls Instrument. It is nothing but the *Perfection* of the *Faculty*; and its *Perfection* is too near to it self, to be properly its *Instrument*. Though in some sort we may say, that the *inferiour Powers* are the *Wills Instruments* in *imperate Acts*; yet I do not think that the *elicite Acts* (such as are the acts of Faith) are performed by *Instruments*, except we may call the Body, the Spirits animal or vital, the Souls *Instruments*: (For though the Soul be *inorganical*, and depend not on the Body *subjectivè & efficienter*, yet I think it doth *objectivè & occasionaliter*, as *Heereboord* explains it (*Disput. Philos.* 43. §. 6. *p.* 615.) If we must not allow the Soul *exterior organs*, as *efficients* of its *elicite Acts*, I think we should have better grounds before we assert these *intrinsick organs*. We must make no unnecessary Composition

position in the Soul. Your similitude therefore of [*the Hand enriching*] is not to the purpose: For the hand is an integral part of the man, but no essential, and therefore may be called his Instrument: But *Faith* in the *Habit*, is the *Perfection* of his most *essential* part: And we think it not proper to say, that the soundness or perfection of the Brain or Heart are their Instruments. Or if it might be so said of the Body, yet must we be more cautelous in ascribing Divisions, Compositions and Instrumentality to the Soul. If any thing therefore (according to your similitude of a Hand) must be called the Instrument of receiving Christ, it must be that part of the Soul which receiveth him: But the Soul receiveth him not by parts, but intirely: The receiving Faculties are the Understanding (introductorily) and the Will (perfectively:) And to say that these are our Instruments of receiving, is to say, that the Soul is the Soul's Instrument, or Man's Instrument. If the meaning be, that the Soul is God's Instrument, I confess so some Philosophers and Divines usually say of all second Causes, that they are the Instruments of God the first Cause: But I know this is not your meaning, and therefore it might seem injurious or unnecessary to load it with the absurdities which follow it in our case.

3. Besides, it must be considered, that Faith is not a proper *natural receiving*, but a *moral imputative receiving* only. It is indeed *a physical Act*, but not *a physical Reception*. For, 1. *Credere est agere, sed recipere est pati: ergo credere non est recipere, sensu physico & proprio.* 2. The Object is not *naturaliter receptible* by our Faith: For, 1. If you say it is *Christ's Satisfaction* that is the *Object*. I answer,

1. That

1. That it was given to God, and not to us; it being God, and not we that was to be ſatisfied: It is only given to us in its *fruits* or benefits procured thereby, and not in it ſelf. 2. If it were, yet it is not phyſically receptible. 2. If you ſay, It is [*Righteouſneſs*] as ours, procured by Chriſt's Satisfaction: I ſay, Righteouſneſs is a Relation, and not *phyſically receptible agendo vel apprehendendo.* 3. If you ſay that Chriſt himſelf is the Object; who knows not that our Faith doth not *phyſically* receive Chriſt himſelf? So that it's undeniable, that Faith is *actio phyſica, ſed receptio tantum moralis vel imputativa:* And therefore (if all were granted, that before is gainſaid) the Habit of Faith could be no other Inſtrument of receiving, but moral or imputative.

4. Laſtly, Let it be conſidered alſo, that the proper *juſtifying Faith* is not the *direct receiving* of *Righteouſneſs*, but the *receiving of Chriſt himſelf*, as he is offered to us in the Goſpel; that ſo *Righteouſneſs* and other benefits may *follow* thereupon. So that it is but remotely, that juſtifying Faith receiveth Righteouſneſs: So that as it is unmeet to ſay, that a Womans Habit of conſenting, is the Inſtrument of enriching her, becauſe ſhe marrieth a man that is rich; ſo much more is it here. Indeed it is a phraſe that containeth a whole heap of Metaphors and Metonymies in it.

But what need I conteſt any further with you, who are of the ſame judgment as I, and yield ſo willingly to all that I deſire; that is, [*That to ſpeak exactly, Faith may better be called a Condition, than an Inſtrument of our Juſtification:*] Why then do you except againſt my Exceptions againſt the improper

proper phrase? If it satisfie you that I bear with the phrase, acknowledging itself improper (which I think is all you desire) then you may be satisfied in the words of mine you last cite: For I love not word-quarrels. But if you think, that I should have overlooked that impropriety, and not have gain-said it: I answer, indeed so I willingly would, but for these Reasons which forbid me: 1. Our Divines ordinarily use the phrase, as if it were exact and proper in their strictest Disputes. 2. They make the Instrumentality of Faith to Justification, the common refuge against many Objections, and the inlet of other mistakes. 3. They are impatient with any that deny it. 4. But that which chiefly moved me was, that they make this a main Fundamental difference between us and the Papists, as if for this one thing (if you joyn also their denial of the Imputation of Christ's personal active Righteousness, as our *formaliter, & non tantum meritorie*) which you and I deny as well as the Papists, and so doth every Divine save one, that hath yet afforded me their Animadversions; and what that one doth, I know not:) I say, as if for denying this, they were certainly damned. I confess it deeply troubleth me to read so ordinarily in our most famous Writers, so much of the Reformed Cause to be laid on a plain Errour. 5. And when Papists read this in ours Writings, it so hardeneth them in their Religion, that they think presently, that all the rest of our Doctrine is like this, and they cast away all in prejudice, and insult over us, and cleave the faster to all the rest of their Errours, to their souls hazard. Judg impartially, Whether these Reasons were not sufficient to constrain me to find fault with

with this phrase of Instrumentality? 1. Specially if you do but add, that it is no phrase of the Holy Ghost, but of man's devising; and therefore I know not why I should in such a case be so tender of it.

Aphorism.

Page 226. LEt *those therefore take heed, who make Faith to justifie, merely because it apprehendeth Christ, which is its natural, essential property.*

Animadvers.

I think few or none make Faith to justifie, merely because it apprehendeth Christ; but because it apprehendeth Christ as he is held out and offered in the Gospel for Righteousness to every one that believeth; and in this, as yet, I see no danger.

Reply.

1. I would they meant as well as you charitably interpret, or understood their own meaning as well as you would have them.

2. Your meaning can be no other than this, according to the proper importance of your words, that [*Faith justifieth quoad rationem formalem*, because the *Gospel giveth* Christ to *Believers*, that is, on *Condition of believing*; and *quoad rationem materialem vel aptitudinalem*, because *Faith is the acceptance of Christ*:] If this be not your meaning, I neither understand it, nor perceive how your words are explicatory.

Aphorism.

Ibid. THat it is *Faith in a proper sense, and not Christ's Righteousness only, may appear thus: 1. From a necessity of a twofold Righteousness, which I have before proved from the twofold Covenant.*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

I think I have before diſproved that which you ſay concerning this twofold Righteouſneſs; neither can I as yet ſee any neceſſity, nor indeed congruity of it. One Righteouſneſs, *viz.* that of Chriſt imputed to us, is ſufficient to juſtifie us; and therefore to make Faith, which is only requiſite to that end, that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs may be imputed to us, a diſtinct Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, to me ſeems very incongruous.

Reply.

Enough of this already, I think.

Aphoriſm.

Page 227. *IT had been as eaſie for the Holy Ghoſt to have ſaid, That Chriſt only is imputed, or Chriſt only juſtifieth, if he had ſo meant.*

Animadverſ.

1. In like manner do Papiſts ſtand upon *hoc eſt Corpus meum*, and diſpute againſt our Expoſition of thoſe words.

2. The meaning of the Holy Ghoſt is to be gathered, by comparing one place of Scripture with another. Now as it is ſaid, that *we are juſtified by Faith*, Rom. 3. 28. & 5. 1. ſo is it ſaid, *By him* (*i. e.* by Chriſt) *all that believe are juſtified*, Acts 13. 39.

3. Therefore we are juſtified indeed by Chriſt, by his Righteouſneſs imputed to us: Only Faith is required of us, that this benefit by Chriſt may be obtained; as the Medicine indeed doth heal, but yet it muſt be applied that it may do it.

Reply.

1. I hold faſt the literal ſenſe of Scripture, not as oppoſed to figurative (as the Papiſts in that point do;) but as it ſignifieth the plain meaning of the words, oppoſed to far-fetch'd forced Interpretation. For the figurative is oft the plain expreſs ſenſe, which is to be received according to the common uſe of thoſe words. Again, if the Papiſts had divers expreſs Texts of Scripture for

their opinion, and we had none againſt them, I would be of their mind. It is a deſperate thing to forſake the plain ſenſe of God's Word, becauſe Papiſts adhere to the literal ſenſe of one Text, againſt the plain more obvious figurative ſenſe, when alſo other Scriptures contradict them. If expreſs Scripture be no proof, when-ever men can put a forced ſenſe on it, or cannot reconcile it with other, what is a proof?

2. I agree to your Rule of Interpretation. But as to the Application, 1. You confeſs we are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith; and I confeſs we are juſtified by Chriſt. But doth it follow, that therefore we are not juſtified by Faith, becauſe we are juſtified by Chriſt? we are not fed by our hands or teeth, becauſe we are fed by our meat? 2. But the Queſtion was about [*imputing for Righteouſneſs.*] The Scripture ſaith, [*Faith is imputed for Righteouſneſs,*] but it no-where ſaith, *Chriſt or his Righteouſneſs is imputed to us for Righteouſneſs.* Now the Queſtion is, Whether by [*Faith,*] the Scripture mean (*not Faith,* but) [*Chriſt,* or his *Righteouſneſs*] and that only? He that will affirm this, muſt prove it. And do you indeed think, that when Scripture ſaith, [*Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs,*] James 2. 23. Rom. 4. 22, 23, 24. that by [*it*] is meant [*Chriſt,*] or [*Chriſt's Righteouſneſs?*] Mr. *Wotton*, Mr. *Gataker*, and *Jo. Goodwin*, have ſaid enough of this. Do you by [*Faith*] mean [*Chriſt,*] when you ſay, *We are juſtified by Faith?* Do not you confeſs that we are *truly* juſtified by *Faith itſelf*, as the *Condition*, as well as by Chriſt as the *meritorious Cauſe?* Why then do you oppoſe the ſame in me? It may you will ſay, Becauſe

cauſe I ſay, Faith juſtifieth as our Righteouſneſs. I anſwer, 1. That is not the Queſtion now under hand; but, Whether it be *Chriſt only*, and *not Faith*. 2. In regard of that Juſtification which I believe you mean, *viz.* from the Accuſation of the Law of Works as ſuch: I ſay, *Faith is but a Condition*, and no otherwiſe juſtifieth. But becauſe it is *made that Condition by a New-Law, per legem remedientem*, and we muſt be judged by *that Law*; therefore when the caſe is, Whether we have performed the Conditions of that New-Law or not? then Faith is *materially that Righteouſneſs* by which we muſt be juſtified, againſt all Accuſations of *non-performance*. 3. I have ſtill acknowledged the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *ſano ſenſu*; (that is, 1. *Per Donationem ejus fructus*: And, 2. *Per Adjudicationem juſtitiæ, nobis inde promeritæ*;) but yet I ſee no ſuch evidence in your Conſequence, that ſhould force me to leave the plain ſenſe of any Text. The Antecedent I embrace, [*All that believe in Chriſt are juſtified*;] But I ſee not how it follows, [therefore *they are juſtified only by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs imputed, and not by Faith imputed*;] (for that's it you muſt ſay, or you ſay nothing to the point.) Indeed you muſt interpret Imputation very fairly, before you can hence prove Imputation it ſelf, much leſs the ſole Imputation.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. *Especially methinks, they that would have Faith to be the Inſtrument of Juſtification, ſhould not deny that we are properly juſtified by Faith, as by an Inſtrument.*

Animadverſ.

1. They that make Faith the *Inſtrument* of Juſtification, underſtand it ſo, as that Faith is a *Condition requiſite* to Juſtification. B. *Davenant de Juſt. habit. c. 22. p. 312.* ſaith, *Luther* doth always acknowledg Faith *inſtrumentalem cauſam Juſtificationis*; yet *de Juſt. Act. c. 30. p. 387.* he ſaith, that to *believe, requiritur ut conditio prævia.*

2. They that make Faith the *Inſtrument* of Juſtification, ſo deny that we are properly juſtified by Faith, as they deny Faith to be that Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified: and hold, that we are ſaid to be juſtified by Faith, becauſe by it we are made partakers of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, which is the formal cauſe of our Juſtification. Thus B. *Davenant*, de Juſt. habit. c. 22. p. 312. *At inquit* Bellarminus, Lutheri *ſententia eſt formalem cauſam Juſtificationis eſſe fidem. Reſp. inſtrumentalem ſemper agnoſcit, non autem formalem, niſi quatenus ſub nomine fidei includit objectum fide comprehenſum; q. d. Chriſti obedientiam fide apprehenſam eſſe cauſam formalem Juſtificationis noſtræ non latuit hoc ipſos Papiſtas: Nam* Vaſquez *ſcribit, Quando apud* Lutherum *fides aſſeritur eſſe juſtitia noſtra formalis, ideo fides appellatur juſtitia, quia per eam apprehendimus Chriſti juſtitiam, qua Juſtificamur. Secundam ſententiam illorum commemorat qui Chriſti obedientiam & juſtitiam nobis imputatam ſtatuunt eſſe formalem cauſam Juſtificationis. At hac communis eſt noſtrorum omnium ſententia: Neq; quod ad ipſam rem attinet, quiſquam è noſtris aliter aut ſenſit aut ſcripſit.* I do the rather cite the words of this Reverend and Learned Author, becauſe I find him highly prized by you, and that not without good cauſe, as I ſuppoſe.

Reply.

1. Your firſt note is little to the matter.

2. Your ſecond is too favourable an Interpretation, as to thoſe men that by their expreſs voluminous contradictions do confute you: Do they not maintain, that the Scripture by [*Faith imputed,*] means [*Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed?*] and do they not thereby exclude [*Faith*] wholly, as to the ſenſe of that Text? My Queſtion was not, Whether it were Faith in this or another ſenſe? but, Whether it

it were *Faith at all* in *any* ſenſe? or, Whether it were Chriſt's Righteouſneſs only which Faith apprehendeth, and not at all Faith it ſelf. Now if they do therefore exclude Faith, becauſe they think the words, [*impute for Righteouſneſs,*] would elſe make it our *Righteouſneſs*; then they do exclude it wholly as to that Text? For if by [*Faith,*] be meant [*Chriſt's Righteouſneſs,*] then what word doth ſignifie [*Faith?*] What ground ſoever they go on, it is evidently an unſound and forced Interpretation.

3. The words of *Davenant* which you cite, and divers others of his ſhew, that he was not of your mind or mine about the Righteouſneſs imputed. It ſeems he diſcerned not the miſtake of them that affirm the active Righteouſneſs formally as ſuch, to be our Righteouſneſs.

4. I do highly reverence *Davenant*, and ſhall anon give you enough of his for the main point in queſtion (about Works:) But far am I from owning this Doctrine which he makes to be *communis noſtrorum ſententia*; *viz.* That Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is *formalis cauſa Juſtificationis*. I hold it to be *cauſa efficiens meritoria, quæ eſt quaſi materialis*; but not *formalis*. For if you ſpeak of *conſtitutive Juſtification active*, that is *formally actio Dei juſtificantis*, viz. *Donatio juſtitiæ*, called by Divines, *Imputation*. If you ſpeak of *conſtitutive paſſive Juſtification*, it is nothing but the *Relation* of [*Juſtified,*] or [*Righte-*

Chriſti juſtitia in Juſtificatione fidelibus imputatur, quatenus ejus merito juſti coram Deo reputamur, Ames. Medul. l. 1. c. 27. §. 12.

So *Alſted.* Diſſine. Theol. c. 23. *Chriſtus eſt juſtitia noſtra in ſenſu cauſali non in ſenſu formali.* So *Rever.* Diſp. de fide.

[*Righteousness*,] or [*non obligatus ad pœnam*,] and [*non condemnandus*:] And Christ's own Relation of [*non condemnandus*,] or [*just*] is not *formally* made ours; though *materially* it is. Accidents perish, if removed from their subject. If you speak of *Justification sententially*, surely none can imagine that the Righteousness of Christ is the *form* of that. But yet perhaps *Davenant* speaking less cautelously, might mean by [*Form*,] the same thing that I do by [*matter*, or *merit*.]

Aphorism.

Page 235. *THe bare act of believing, is not the only Condition of the New-Covenant, but several other duties are also parts of that Condition*, &c.

Animadverf.

I know no reason to deny this: But the New-Covenant containeth more in it than Justification; and therefore it follows not, that all other things which make up the Condition of the New-Covenant, must go before Justification, as the Condition requisite for the obtaining of it. Good-works and obedience follow after Justification, as the fruits of that Faith by which we are justified. They which have believed (and so are justified) must be careful to maintain good works, Tit. 3.8. *Utcunq; bona opera, quæ sunt mandata in Lege requirantur necessario à Justificatis, ut fructus Sanctificationis & officia gratitudinis, tamen siquis ea exigat ut causas Justificationis, Christum ac fidem evacuat.* Daven. de Justit. act. cap. 30. p. 394. And besides, that we must first believe, and so be justified, before that we can do Good-works, our Good-works at the best are imperfect, and therefore we cannot be justified by them, *Psal.* 130. 3,4. & 143. 2.

Reply.

1. There is none of this against any thing that I say, except the last sentence. But it follows not, that because *Obedience followeth* Justification-begun,

that

that therefore it is no Condition of its *continuance*; or that therefore it is no Condition of *sentential Justification* at Judgment.

2. I easily grant, that Faith or Works are no *causes* of our Justification (which *Davenant* meant) from the Accusation of the Law of Works; but *eo nomine*, because it is the Condition constituted by a New-Law, it must be the *subjectum primum* of our Justification, when the case is, *Whether that Condition be performed?* Will you tell me how you look to be justified, if the Devil accuse you to be *an Infidel*, a *finally impenitent person*, a *sinner against the Holy Ghost*, &c. even as if you were accused of being a *Traytor* to the State, by pleading your own Innocency, Righteousness, or Not-guiltiness.

3. The Imperfection of our Faith and Obedience, will prove that it cannot be our *universal* or *legal Righteousness*; but not that it is not our *performance of the Gospel-Condition*, and so our *justitia praestita Conditionis*.

Aphorism.

Page 236. *THat Love, and sincere Obedience, and works of Love, are also parts of the Condition, appeareth in these Scriptures*, Luke 7.47. *(though I know Mr.* Pink's *Interpretation of this)* &c.

Animadvers.

Mr. *Pink*'s Interpretation (as I remember, for I have not his Book by me now, though I have read it long ago) is this, that when it is said, *Luke* 7.47. *Her sins which are many are forgiven, for she loved much*: The particle *for* imports as much as *therefore*. His meaning is, that her loving much was not the cause why many sins were forgiven her; but this, that many sins were forgiven her, was the cause that she loved

much. And that this is the true and genuine meaning of the words (though there be no necessity of expounding *for* by *therefore*) appears by those which follow immediately after; *But to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little*, viz. in comparison of him to whom much is forgiven. So also the Parable propounded by our Saviour, *v.* 41. *&c.* doth clearly shew the import of those words objected. Mr. *Pink*'s Interpretation therefore for the substance of it, is right and good, and in effect the same with *Calvin*'s, *Caeterum hic dilectio non dicitur esse venia causa, sed posterius signum, ut prius admonui*, saith he upon the place. And at *v.* 41. *Mirum est plerosq; interpretes tam crasse hallucinatos esse, quasi haec mulier veniam lachrimis, unctione, & osculis pedum promerita sit. Nam argumentum quo utitur Christus, non à causa, sed ab effectu sumptum est: quia & prius ordine est beneficium accipere, quam habere gratiam; & causa mutuis amoris hic notatur gratuita remissio.* Vid. etiam *Bezam* ad locum. Et *Amesi.* in *Bellarm.* Enerv. §. 1. c. 4. ad 4.

Reply.

I mentioned that Text among many more, not relying on that only or chiefly; and therefore added those words, not meaning thereby to deny Mr. *Pink*'s Interpretation: But *q. d.* yet I know Mr. *Pink* hath otherwise interpreted this, and much may be said for each sense. It is hard to be certain of the mind of the Holy Ghost, where the words will bear both senses. I remembred his Arguments, as well as his words; and I remember much that may be said against them. For my part, I determine it not: Let every one abound in his own sense, I see no reason to stand to dispute it.

Aphorism.

Page 240, 241. *This preferring of Christ above all in Judgment, Will and Affection, is in my judgment the very essential property of true Faith, differencing it from all false Faith, and*

so

so an essential part of it: I know this is like to seem strange, &c.

Animadvers.

1. I know not why this should seem strange, if it be rightly understood. You say a little after, [*Affiance, and sincere Obedience, and works of Love, are the necessary, immediate, inseparable products of Faith:*] So the Apostle saith, *That faith worketh through love*, Gal. 5. 6.

2. Indeed I do not see how sincere Obedience, and works of Love, are the immediate products of Faith, as *Affiance* is. But, to let that pass; that they are the products of Faith, who will deny?

3. Yet are we not therefore justified by them, as well as by Faith, as it apprehendeth Christ and his Righteousness, as you seem to intend.

Reply.

1. If you knew how sharply I am dealt with for that passage, you would think my prognostick failed not, though you know not why any should think it strange.

2. As Affiance directly follows the Acceptance of Christ, as one to be trusted in; so internal Obedience directly followeth accepting of Christ, as King to rule us.

3. I there meddle not with your induced Consequence of Justification. But this follows: If it be a sufficient reason to exclude internal Obedience or Love to Christ, from being any of the Condition of Justification (as continued and sentential) because they are but fruits of the principal justifying Faith, then it would be a good reason to exclude Affiance. But it is confessed to be no good reason to exclude Affiance; therefore, *&c.* Again, if Affiance be but a fruit of the principal act of justifying Faith, and yet justifie it self, then it is not any one act only that justifieth: But, *&c.* therefore, *&c.*

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 243. *When we are said to be justified by Faith only, &c. all those forementioned duties are implied or included.*

Animadvers.

They are all implied or included as accompanying Faith, or proceeding from Faith, but not as concurring with Faith to Justification. *Bellarmin* confesseth that *Calvin* hath these words: *Sola fides est qua Justificat sed fides tantum qua Justificat non est sola: sicut calor solus solus est qui calefacit, ipse tamen non est solus, sed cum splendore.* And the same also he saith is taught by *Melancton*, *Brentius*, *Chemnitius*, &c. Bell. de Just. l. 1. c. 14.

Reply.

1. They are implied as *Conditional* to the *Continuation* and *Consummation* of that Justification, which is begun upon sole believing. As *Marriage-fidelity* is implied as *conditional* of the *Continuance* of that Womans interest in her Husband, and his riches and honours, which she *first received* upon mere *accepting* him or *Marriage*. For *Marriage* contains the *promise* of that *after-fidelity*: And sure the promise implieth the performance as necessary to follow. So is our Faith and accepting of Christ for Saviour and Lord, which containeth our Covenant to trust and obey him.

2. And some of them are implied as part of the *first Condition*, as *Repentance*, knowledg of Christ, love to Christ, desire after Christ, highly esteeming him, &c. My Reasons for this, and how far Faith is, or is not alone in justifying, follow after.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 247. *This being well considered, will direct you where to find the very formal Being and Nature of Faith*, &c.

Animadverſ.

The Nature of Faith, I think is fully ſet forth, *Heb.* 11. 13. in theſe words, *Theſe all died in faith, having not received the Promiſes* (*i. e.* the things promiſed) *but ſaw them afar off, and were perſwaded of them, and embraced them.* Theſe words ſhew, that three things concur to make up Faith: 1. Knowledg; They ſaw the Promiſes, though afar off. 2. Aſſent; They were perſwaded of them. 3. Application; They embraced them.

Reply.

This is the ſame that I conſtantly affirm: Only by [*Application*,] I doubt not you mean the act of the Will, Conſent, Acceptance, Election, the ſame that Embracement in the Text is, and not that which ſome old great Divines call Application, *viz.* A believing that our own ſins are pardoned. I am glad you ſee the inconvenience of making one ſingle act only to juſtifie, or the act of one faculty only.

Aphorism.

Page 250. *Much leſs are any Promiſes or Benefits of Chriſt the proper Object of Juſtifying Faith, as many Divines do miſtakingly conceive.*

Animadverſ.

I confeſs I know not well what to make of this. Are no Promiſes the proper Object of juſtifying Faith? What hath Faith to lay hold on without a Promiſe? We cannot believe in Chriſt, but as he is promiſed and held out in the Goſpel. Firſt they ſaw the Promiſes, and then were perſwaded of them, and embraced them, *Heb.* 11. 13. By the Promiſes (as I ſaid) are

are meant the things promised; but neither a Promise without a thing promised, nor a thing promised without a Promise, is imaginable. Perhaps you will say, The Promises are the ground of Faith, not the object of it. Indeed, if we distinguish betwixt a Promise, and a thing promised, yet the Promise it self must be believed: And indeed, neither can we believe a Promise, but we must believe the thing promised; nor can we believe a thing promised, but we must believe the Promise.

Reply.

I spake as other men, that make one object, even Christ himself to be the direct or proper object: But I repent of the narrow use of the word [*Proper Objecti*;] for indeed, God, Heaven, the Promise, the Benefits, may be called Objects of it too. Yet,

1. It is plainly expressed, and I doubt not but you have many a time read the like before in the Learnedst Divines; *viz.* That the object of that Faith which justifies, is not *axioma aliquod*, but an *incomplex term*, viz. *Christ himself*, Amesius Medull. l. 1. c. 3. §. 9. *In Scripturis vel promissionibus, enunciationes continent & exhibent objectum fidei, vocanturq; objectum fidei per metonymiam adjuncti. Bonum quod proponitur assequendum qua tale, est finis & effectum fidei, non proprie objectum ipsum: Illud vero cujus vi nitimur, in assecutione boni illius est proprium objectum fidei,* 1 Cor. 1. 23. *Prædicamus Christum, &* 2. 2. *non statui quicquam sci inter vos nisi Jesum Christum,* 2 Cor. 5. 19. *Deus in Christo.* So also *cap.* 27. §. 15, 17. *Fides igitur illa proprie dicitur Justificans qua incumbimus in Christum ad remissionem peccatorum & salutem. Christus enim est adæquatum objectum fidei, quatenus fides Justificat. Fides enim non alia ratione Justificat nisi quatenus apprehendit*

prehendit illam justitiam propter quam Justificamur: Illa autem justitia non est in veritate alicujus axiomatis, cui assensum præbemus, sed in Christo solo, 2 Cor. 5. 21. *Hinc toties illæ in N. T. repetitæ conciones quæ Justificationem in persona sola Christi quærendam ostendunt*, Joh. 1. 12. & 3. 15,16. & 6. 40, 47. & 14.1,54. Rom.4.5. & 3.26. Acts 10. 43. & 25.18. Gal. 3. 26. So also in *Disput. de Fid. divin. verit.* And I have shewed you, *Append.* p. 111,112, &c. that Dr. *Preston* and others most frequently have the same.

2. I fully enough (I thought) opened my meaning to you to this effect. Justifying Faith is the motion of the *whole Soul to Christ*. It containeth therefore the action of *both Faculties*. In the *intellect* Assent is its act, and the *Word* or *Promise* is *its neerest object*, though not its *chief* (as I opened my meaning, *p.* 260.) For as *Amesius Medul.* l. 2. c. 5. §. 23, 24. *Hoc objectum est immediatè semper aliquod axioma vel enunciatio sub ratione veri, sed illud in quo principaliter terminatur fides, de quo & propter quod assensus præbetur illi axiomati per fidem, est ens incomplexum sub ratione boni*, Rom. 4.21. Heb. 11.13. *Actus (enim) credentis non terminatur ad axioma, sed ad rem, fatentibus Scholasticorum clarissimis. Ratio est, quia non formamus axiomata, nisi ut per ea de rebus cognitionem habeamus. Principalis igitur terminus in quem tendit actus credentis, est res ipsa, quæ in axiomate præcipue spectatur.* But as the act of the *Understanding* is but *preparatory*, introductory and subservient to that of the *Will*, whereby the Soul cleaveth to *God as good*, being but the *means* to it, or the imperfect Rudiments of it: So *Assent* to the *truth* of the *Promise*, is but such an initial or introductory

ductory act, as to *Consent*, or the *Wills Acceptance* of the *good offered*. These acts of the intellect (in affectionate or practical matters) are but imperfect acts of the Soul, and so but *imperfecte humani vel morales*: And therefore we commonly distinguish *intellectual* Acts and Vertues from *moral*. Not that I think they are not truly *humani & morales*, but it is in a more *imperfect kind*; as the digestion in the stomach, before Sanguification: Nor do I agree to *Amesius*, who placeth justifying Faith *only in the Will* (no more than to *Camero*, who placeth it *only* in the *Intellect*:) But till it come to the Will, it is not *perfect*, nor so fully to be ascribed to the *whole man*. And therefore saith *Gibieuf* de Libert. *Finis intellectus est veri notitia, sed finis hominis intelligentis est amor Dei.* As the *sense* is *for the Intellect*, so the *Intellect* is *for the Will* here. And therefore it is the act of the *Will* that is the *compleat* and *principal act* of justifying Faith, and the object of that act is the *proper principal object* of justifying Faith.

Now this compleat principal act of Faith; (*viz.* The *Will's Acceptance*, *Election* or *Consent*, *velle bonum oblatum*) hath not the *Word* or *Promise* for

I mean not by all this, that only this which I call the principal act, is the Condition of our Justification; but that it is the most *special* act implying the rest, as the generical. Yea, and the final object is the principal in excellency; as the end is better than the means as such, though the mediate object be the special proper object. And as when believing and consenting to my Physician, importeth that health and life is my end, and is so included or connoted in his Office or Relation: So Heaven, that is, God to be perfectly loved, and enjoyed, and obeyed, is the end of Christ's Mediatorship, and the final and most excellent object of our Faith.

its

its proper material object; but Christ himself, as in his Office, and *to the ends* and *uses* of that Office; and so the benefits are final or remoter objects indeed, and still implied. The accepting of the *Word*, or the accepting of *Justification*, are neither of them this *compleat special act of justifying Faith*; but the *accepting of Christ*. As the act wherein the essence of Marriage doth principally consist, is not believing each others *words* (which is pre-requisite) nor yet accepting the riches or honours of each other: But accepting each other in the Conjugal Relations; or the *Wills consent* (and its *expression*, if we speak of it *quoad forum exterius*.) And the Condition of a womans enjoying her Husband's honour and estate, is not principally her *believing him*, nor yet her *accepting his honour and estate*; but her *accepting himself in Marriage*. So I think it is here. Yet the truth of God or his Word, is the object of that introductory initial act of justifying Faith, called *Assent*. Methinks this is so plain, that you may well know what to make of it. *Neq; nobis absurdum videtur, sed valde consentaneum, actum illum quo tota anima Purificatur & Justificatur ad totam animam pertinere: ita ut in nudo intellectu habeat initium, in voluntate complementum.* Davenant. Deter. Q. 37. p. 166.

Aphorism.

Page 255. TO the 66. *that Christ as a Saviour only, or in respect of his Priestly Office only, is not the object of justifying Faith, but that Faith doth as really and immediately receive him as King, and in so doing justifie: This I prove thus*, &c.

Anim.

Animadverſ.

1. The Arguments which you uſe, prove only thus much, that Chriſt muſt be received as well in reſpect of his Kingly, as in reſpect of his Prieſtly Office; But not that we are juſtified by the one, as well as by the other. Still we muſt diſtinguiſh *inter fidem quæ Juſtificat, & fidem quâ Juſtificat. Obſervandum eſt* (ſaith *Ameſius*) *nos non reſtringere fidem illam quæ Juſtificat, ſed tantum quæ Juſtificat, ad permiſſionem miſericordiæ.* Ames. in Bellar. Ener. *l.* 5. *c.* 1.

2. If Chriſt's *Satisfaction* be our Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, and Chriſt as Prieſt ſatisfied for us; then by *receiving him as Prieſt*, we are juſtified: Though it's true, none can indeed receive him as Prieſt, except they receive him as King alſo.

Reply.

1. I think the Arguments uſed, if rightly taken, prove more than you ſay. But becauſe I come newly from manifeſting their forms and vigour, to two or or three other Learned Animadverters, I ſhall not attempt it again on this ſhort invitation.

2. You confeſs I have proved the receiving Chriſt as King, to be the *fides quæ Juſtificat:* And then it belongs *to you* to prove the *excluſion* of it in this Conſideration: Scripture ſaith, *We are juſtified by faith:* You confeſs, it is by *this faith*, or *this act*: If therefore you ſay moreover, *It is by this*, but *not as ſuch*, you muſt prove the *excluſion* of that reſpect; for *ubi Lex nec diſtinguit nec limitat, non eſt diſtinguendum vel limitandum.* He therefore that affirms the Diſtinction or Limitation, muſt prove it. Which I deſpair of ſeeing well done here.

3. I reverence thoſe Learned Divines, that uſe to diſtinguiſh of the *fides quæ*, and the *fides quâ:* But indeed, I am paſt doubt, that it is here a uſeleſs diſtinction, and only built on a begging of the Queſtion. The word [*quâ*] reſpecteth either [*Juſtificat,*]

cat,] or, [*fides.*] *Fides quâ Justificat, tantum Justificat: Ita enim loquimur non quid sit, sed quid producit.* If you refer [*qua*] to [*fides,*] so as to mean, *Fides quâ Christi sacerdotis apprehensio Justificat, & tantum quâ talis*: Then, 1. This is inconveniently expressed, to say [*qua Justificat,*] instead of [*quâ Christum apprehendit.*] 2. And it is a begging of the Question. It supposeth, that [*hæc fides, vel hic fidei actus qua talis, & non qua conditio formaliter Justificat,*] which I deny: Yea, and it supposeth that *solus hic actus Justificat*, which is also denied.

4. I would you would shew me, in what sense or respect it is, that the *receiving of Christ as King* doth *justifie*. You say, it is the *fides quæ Justificat*: And then it is certainly *a justifying act*: Now if it do justifie, and yet not *qua talis*, as such as it is, then as what? It is not the same act most say, as the *receiving Christ as Priest*: Will you say, [*The receiving Christ as King*] doth justifie, as it is the receiving him *as Priest?* that were to say, [*by doing that which it doth not,*] according to the common judgment. But if you mean, that it is the *same Habit*, which performeth *both Acts*, and only *one* of the Acts justifie: I say, you should then call the *Habit only*, and that *one Act*, the *fides quæ*; and not *that act* which is not the *fides quæ* (in your esteem.)

Of this read what I have written at large against Mr. *Warner*, about the Object of justifying Faith.

5. The [*quâ*] should signifie the *formal Reason* of its *interest* in the work of Justifying. But that (I think I have proved, and shall do) is not *its nature*, as it is *this Act* or *that* (that is but *its Aptitude* to this Office) but its being the *Condition* of Justi-

fication, which *God* hath *instituted*, and *man performed*. If therefore it justifie not *qua fides, vel quâ hic actus*, but *quâ conditio præstita*, then *every Act* must justifie, which is such *a Condition*: For *a quatenus ad omne valet argumentum.*

6. Your own Argument I grant wholly [*If Christ as Priest satisfied.* &c.] But all you conclude is, that [therefore *by receiving him as Priest we are justified.*] But who denieth it? You left out Ip [*only*:] Which had you put in, I had denied the Consequence with that addition. It is such another Argument as this: *If a man only as rich, do enrich his wife; and only as honourable, do honour her; and only as merciful and potent, doth deliver her from danger: then the Act on her part which enricheth her, is only the receiving him as a rich man; and not as an honourable man, nor as a husband only: And the Act which dignifieth her, is only the receiving him as honourable.* No such matter! But the receiving him as a *Husband* (though she never look to his riches or honour) is that Act on her part, which *giveth right* to his riches, honour and all: And then these benefits are but consequential thereto.

7. Let me therefore here once for all (that you may understand my meaning) tell you, That when we say [*Faith justifies in this respect, and not in that,*] *distinguendum est*: Either we speak *ex parte objecti* only, in what respect the *Object received* doth justifie; or else *ex parte actus nostri*, in what respect *our Act of Faith* justifieth: And so I affirm *ex parte objecti* (I speak not *de objecto formaliter, sed materialiter in se*) that *Christ received*, doth not justifie (*satisfactorily* and *meritoriously*) as *King*, but as *Priest*: (Though yet *sententialiter & ut efficiens principalis*, he

he justifies as *King*.) But if the Question be, *Ex parte actus nostri?* I say, it is not our receiving Christ *as Priest only*, nor as *King*, but as the *Mediator-God-man*, to be our *Head*, *Husband*, *Lord* and *Saviour* that justifieth, as being the *Condition* on which Justification is *given* us: And so receiving him *as King*, hath *as near* a hand in it, as receiving him as *Priest*; (for this is that *part of the Condition* which the World *most sticks* at.) As in the forementioned similitude *ex parte objecti*, the *husbands dignity* doth not *enrich* the wife, nor his *riches ennoble* her: But *ex parte actus*, as to the *Condition* on *her part*, it is *undivided* as to the essential Matrimonial respects, *viz.* [That she take the man to be *her husband*, to be loved, obeyed, and faithfully cleave to him only:] But the respect to his *riches* and *honour* in marrying him, is not that which gives her title to them; (that is, but collaterally requisite, if at all;) but her first having right *in him*, whose they are.

Aphorism.

Page 259. IF *Mr.* Cotton *say, as the Lord* Brook *represents him, That Faith can be nothing else but a laying hold of that Promise which God hath made, it is a foul errour*, &c.

Animadverf.

I presume Mr. *Cotton* by [*Promise*,] meant the [*Promise as containing Christ in it*,] and that he spake of Faith *as justifying*. *Quamvis multa sint exercitia & objecta fidei, non tamen Justificans est, nisi prout respicit misericordiam Dei in Christo.* Amef. Bell. Enerv. *l.* 5. *c.* 2. *ad* 8.

Reply.

I like your fair Exposition; whereby you leave the Errour, as being in his language, and not in his

ſenſe. For as *Chriſt is*, ſaith *Ameſ. Objectum adequatum fidei Juſtificantis*, ſo [*nothing elſe but*] is too palpable an excluſion in all appearance: And no exact man in defining, ſhould either *exclude*, or *but imply* the adequate object of that Act which he defineth. But I truly love charitable Interpretation, and only endeavour to keep the *ill ſenſe* out of credit, and not ſo Reverend a man.

Aphoriſm.

Page 266. I *Take Love to be ſome degree of juſtifying Faith, and not properly a fruit of it.*

Animadverſ.

I think it is properly a fruit of juſtifying Faith. *We love him, becauſe he loved us firſt*, 1 John 4.19. His love apprehended by us, which is by Faith, doth work in us love towards him again. For otherwiſe, though God love us never ſo much, yet if we do not apprehend it, we ſhall not therefore love him. B. *Davenant* de Juſt. act. *c.* 30. *p.* 387. reckons *amare Deum, inter effecta à fide Juſtificante neceſſariò manantia.*

Reply.

To your Argument I anſwer:

1. The Text may argue, not *à ratione objectivâ*; but *à ratione efficiente*; *q. d.* Becauſe he firſt loved us, therefore hath he prevented us by his Grace, and given us hearts to love him again.

2. If you were ſure it argued *à ratione objectivâ*, yet you endeavour to prove no more, but that the *aſſenting act* of *Faith* goes before love; which I affirm as much as you, while I ſay, it goes before Conſent, Acceptance, Election.

3. Your Argument, as you urge it, tends to prove that *Love*, even in *time* follows Faith: Yet you never yet denied that *Acceptance* and *Election* is a juſtifying act: And can you think, that *Acceptatio*

ceptatio vel Electio boni, hath no *love* in it, but is wholly antecedent? or that the Apostles ἀσπασάμενοι, *embracing*, Heb. 11. 13. which you cited, containeth *no love* in it? Your Friend and mine Mr. *Leigh* thought it did. See what he citeth, *Crit. Sacr.* out of *Davenant*, and *Beza*, and *Paræus*, *Est amanter amplecti, & salutare & osculari.*

4. The first orderly *love to God* in the Soul ariseth not from our *belief* or *assurance*, that he *loves us in particular* more than others of the World, but from the apprehension of his *natural excellency*, *goodness*, and *common love to mankind in giving Christ for them*, and in him *offering to be* freely reconciled to them, and tendring Christ, and Pardon, and Salvation to them; upon the *belief* of *which*, they *lovingly accept* Christ offered, which is the compleat act of justifying Faith, being the Marriage between Christ and the Soul. And so, as you may say, the *compleat act* of Faith, is a fruit of the *incompleat act*: So you may say, that *this love* is a fruit of *this belief.*

5. And I need not again tell you, that I neither speak of any *other love* here, but *love to the accepted Redeemer*, or *Head* and *Husband Christ* (whom we do not *accept* or *marry first*, and only *after love* him, but do *lovingly accept*) nor of the *following acts of love* in our lives, which may be called the fruits of our first *loving acceptance*. Chamier. Panstrat. de Fide, l. 12. c. 4. (mihi) p. 375. *Omnis amor est actus voluntatis: At fides est amor: ergo, &c. minor probatur. Vera fides est ea quæ credit in Deum: At credere in Deum est amare Deum, &c.*

6. *Aquinas*, and others ordinarily say, That *Love*, as it is in the *rational part*, is nothing but *Velle*, 1, 2. *q.* 22. *a.* 3. 3. & 1. *q.* 20. *a.* 1. so *Zanchius* very

oft. So *Tolet.* de Anima. in l. 3. c. 9. q. 27,28. *Circa bonum prima passio est amor. Amor est omnium prima & ipsarum parens, &c. Amor est,* 1. *Concupiscentiæ.* 2. *Benevolentiæ vel amicitiæ. Ille est velle bonum ad se ordinando, &c. Alter est velle bonum propter seipsum, &c.* Vid. ultra. So *Gerson* part. 4. fol. 27. *de Passionibus animæ,* Amesʃ. contr. Grevinchov. pag. 16. Abundance more I could cite, ſpecially Philoſophers, to the ſame purpoſe, but that I will not ſo trouble you and my ſelf in vain. Now certainly *Acceptance* is *velle bonum*; and certainly before *velle* there is no act of the Will to good.

7. I deny not *amare Deum* to be an effect, in the ſenſe oft explained already.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. *THe Will's apprehenſion of a thing good, which we call an earneſt willing of it, and accepting it, is (in my judgment) the ſame thing as* Love, &c.

Animadverſ.

You ſpeak of a thing *preſent and enjoyed*; and ſo diſtinguiſh juſtifying Faith from Deſire and Hope: [*Deſire and Hope* (ſay you, *p.* 267.) *as ſuch, do properly conſider their Object as abſent, which this juſtifying Faith doth not.*] Now Chriſt muſt be received by Faith, that ſo he may be *preſent* and *enjoyed*, and conſequently, that he may be loved as ſuch. And therefore Love in this ſenſe is rather a fruit of Faith, than a part of it, as you endeavour to prove.

Reply.

1. As Deſire and Hope conſider their Object as Abſent, ſo they are only, *quoad accidentalem hunc reſpectum*, different from love, and not from any real eſſential objective difference.

2. Faith

2. Faith and Love here do consider their Object as alike present. There is no need of Faith to make it present before it can be accepted and loved; it is God's offer that makes it present: And he offers it me to be at once *lovingly accepted*, and not to be first accepted, and then *loved* only.

3. We look not at Christ as [*enjoyed*] when we first *love* him; but as *bonum conveniens* offered to be enjoyed.

4. If by [*receiving by Faith,*] you mean, [*Assent to the truth of the Word,*] then it is true, that this must go before Love: But it is as true, that it must go before Acceptance.

Aphorism.

Page 267. *IF Love be an act of the same Will, and have the same Object with Consent, Election, Acceptance, &c. Why should it not then be the same Act?*

Animadverſ.

Love, as you take it, considereth its Object as present and enjoyed; therefore it differs from Consent, Election and Acceptance, which go before Enjoyment: So much your self confesses immediately, saying, [*Acceptance considereth* its *Object as offered; Election considereth it as propounded with some other Competitor; Consent considereth it as we are perswaded and invited to it.*]

Reply.

Neither so, nor so.

1. I never thought that *all Love* considereth its Object as *present*, much less *as enjoyed*; but only *amor complacentiæ*. I only said, that Love considereth it *not as absent* (as *Desire* and *Hope* do;) that is, It is not necessary to the denomination of Love, that we consider the Object *as absent*: I spoke negatively,

tively, not that I ever thought it neceſſary, that therefore it muſt conſider it as preſent and enjoyed: Love conſidereth it more ſimply than other Paſſions do, that is, as *bonum conveniens*: It is *accidental* to it, to conſider it *as abſent*, or *as preſent*. Therefore Deſire and Hope are Love with ſuch an accidental variation.

2. As the ſaid *accidental differences* of the *Object* in mere extrinſick reſpects, do not make the Object to be divers: (It is not *one good* that *is offered*, and *another* that is *deliberated* on, and *another* that we are *fore-invited* to;) ſo they make not *Acceptance*, *Election*, *Conſent*, to be *ſeveral acts*, much leſs one to follow another as their fruit: No more doth it make *Love* to differ from them. All is but *velle bonum*, viz. *Chriſtum oblatum*. Cannot mine eye ſee at once this wall as it is *white*, as it is *quantum*, as it is *unum*, as it is thus or thus ſcituate, ſtanding Eaſt or Weſt, facing that other Wall, near to this Wall, and like to it, *&c.* Muſt all theſe be ſeveral acts in the ſubſtance, and one the fruit of another?

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. *But all theſe are extrinſick Conſiderations: They conſider their Object as good, and ſo doth Love.*

Animadverſ.

But that is not enough to make them and *Love* all one. For ſo Deſire and Hope conſider their Object as good, yet are not therefore the ſame with Conſent, Election, Acceptance, nor yet with Love, as the Object of it, is Good-enjoyed: For the Object of Deſire and Hope, is Good-abſent.

Reply.

It is not enough to give *Love* the *name* of *Acceptance* or *Conſent*, &c. But it is enough to prove

Acceptance

Acceptance and *Consent* to be *Love*. *Love* is the substance of the Act; the other are the same Act, as respecting the same Object, but not simply as *good*, but with the addition of some respects extrinsecal. The *Genus* is truly in the *Species*, though the *Species* is not the *Genus*, nor the *Genus* to be called by the name of the *Species*. *Amare & velle bonum*, is all one. Acceptance, Election, Consent are all *velle*; but not *velle bonum simpliciter*, *sed cum hoc vel illo respectu superaddito*: And therefore *omne velle non est acceptare*, sed *omne acceptare est velle*. *Et ita dicendum de Amore*.

Aphorism.

Page 268. *IT is not said, that Love justifieth, but Faith that worketh (even in its essential work of accepting) by Love.*

Animadvers.

So Love must needs be taken for Desire, not for that Love which is carried out towards a thing enjoyed, which is *Amor complacentiæ*. But I do not conceive that to be the Apostle's meaning, Gal. 5. 6. *Quantum ad præsentem locum attinet*, Paulus *nequaquam disputat, an charitas ad justificandum co-operatur fidei, sed tantum indicat quæ nunc sint vera fidelium exercitia, &c. ergo cum versaris in causa Justificationis cave ullam charitatis vel operum mentionem admittas, sed mordicus retine particulam exclusivam.* Calv. ad loc.

Reply.

1. *Amor desiderii*, vel *concupiscentiæ*, is as common a phrase as *Amor complacentiæ*.

2. It is as proper to say, *Desire* is *Love*, or *Complacency* is *Love*; as to say, *Amor concupiscentiæ*, & *Amor complacentiæ*. Both phrases express that there is *Love*, with an additional respect.

3. I love to interpret Scripture in the most comprehensive sense: To say the Apostle excluded this operation,

operation, may be ſooner done, than to prove it: But of that, judg as you ſee meet.

4. *James* took not *Calvin*'s counſel in his phraſe of Speech.

Aphoriſm.

Page 269. *CHriſt doth propound it* (viz. *Love*) *in the Goſpel, as of the ſame neceſſity*, &c.

Animadverſ.

Love, and all obedience, are propounded as neceſſary, but not as neceſſary to Juſtification. They flow from juſtifying Faith, but are not properly parts of it.

Reply.

(1.) *John* 16. 27. & 14. 21. Makes *Love* the *antecedent Condition* of *God's Love* and *Chriſt's Love* to the perſon. And that goeth with *Remiſſion*, and is a Love of Reconciliation: And Reconciliation comprehendeth Remiſſion. At leaſt, you will never ſhew out of Scripture, that the *procuring God's Love*, and the procuring *Remiſſion* and *Reconciliation*, have not the ſame *Conditions*.

(2.) Love is confeſſed a Condition of our *Glorification*, Jam. 1.12. & 2. 5. *John* 14.21, *&c.* And it is to me paſt doubt, that *Glorification*, and *ſentential Juſtification* at *judgment*, have the *ſame Conditions*.

3. I eaſily acknowledge, that *Obedience* is a fruit of Faith, and not a part of it, properly taken: And ſo is *other Love*.

Aphoriſm.

Page 270, 271. *THat both* (viz. *Faith and Love*) *are neceſſary to Juſtification, is doubtleſs, and that they are concurrent in apprehending Chriſt.*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

This which you ſay is *doubtleſs*, is generally not *doubted*, but *denied* by our Divines. Love, as diſtinguiſhed from Deſire, preſuppoſeth Chriſt already apprehended, and ſo Juſtification already obtained; and therefore it doth not concur with Faith in apprehending Chriſt, nor is it neceſſary to Juſtification.

Reply.

1. Either you or I miſtake the common judgment of Divines. How many have anſwered me (beſides all that I have read) that Love is neceſſary *quoad præſentiam, ſed non quoad Inſtrumentalitatem, vel Cauſalitatem.* Nay how many have told me of *Works themſelves* (much more of *Love*) that they are indeed *Conditions of our Juſtification*, but not *Inſtruments:* (ſo Mr. *Ball* of the Covenant;) and chiefly blame me, that I bring them ſo near together, by not giving more to Faith, than merely to be a *Condition*; which (ſay they) *Works* are as well as Faith. Nay, how commonly do ours on *James* 2. and againſt the Papiſts ſay, that *Fides ſolum juſtificat, ſed non ſola:* Faith without Works in *Cauſality*, but not in *Concomitancy*. And if it be not *ſola without Works*, ſure not *without Love*. Though for my part I affirm, that as to Works of *external Obedience*, it is *ſolum & ſola* in our firſt Juſtification.

It is not true, that all Complacence ſuppoſeth the Object, either preſent or enjoyed; but only that *in eſſe cognito*, as *apprehended good*, it be complacential to the will of the perſon who thinketh of it. And there is Complacency in all Deſire and Hope, yea, in our grief, for not enjoying the good.

2. You intimate a Conceſſion, that *Amor concupiſcentiæ* is pre-requiſite. And I ſpeak not of *Amor complacentiæ*, as reſpecting the Object *enjoyed:* But indeed

indeed of *Amor acceptationis vel electionis*, as properly ſo called as either of the other.

3. Acceptance preſuppoſeth the Promiſe to be believed as true, and Chriſt to be known to be good; and yet Juſtification is not attained before that Acceptance or Love. But all Love doth not preſuppoſe Acceptance, Conſent, Election or Affiance, no more than *velle* preſuppoſeth them. The names plainly evince this.

Aphoriſm.

Page 286. *AS the accepting of Chriſt for Lord (which is the* hearts Subjection) *is as eſſential a part of juſtifying Faith, as the accepting him for Saviour: So conſequently, ſincere Obedience (which is the effect of the former) hath as much to do in juſtifying us before God, as (ſome) Affiance, * which is the fruit of the latter.*

* Yet no doubt but *truſt* in *Chriſt* is an eſſential act of Faith: And I ſpake not here diſtinctly enough of Affiance; but meant only a *quieting* truſt: But all true belief is a truſting to his Word or Veracity; that is, to his Wiſdom, Goodneſs and Power, whom we believe.

Animadverſ.

(1.) This accepting of Chriſt for Lord, is as eſſential a part of juſtifying Faith, as the accepting him for Saviour; but not of Faith as juſtifying. Chriſt is our Saviour in ſatisfying for us, and in that reſpect doth Faith apprehend Chriſt as it juſtifieth.

(2.) For Faith juſtifieth, as it apprehendeth Chriſt's Satisfaction, which is that Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified.

Reply.

(1.) I have already anſwered this of *fides quæ & qua*. I take your Conceſſion for the *quæ*, and ſtay till you either prove the *quâ* as contradiſtinct, or

or this distinction to have tolerable sense, when well scan'd.

(2.) I mainly differ with you in the last point, which is your ground-work in other differences. Faith justifieth not directly, as it apprehendeth Christ's Satisfaction (you should say, *Righteousness* which was *merited by it:* For the *Satisfaction itself* was never *offered to us*, but *given to God for us*; unless by *apprehending*, you mean only *assenting* to the *truth* of it:) But Faith justifieth directly or *formally*, as the *Condition of the Gift*; and *materially* or *aptitudinally*, as the *receiving of Christ himself:* And then his Righteousness is to follow our Union or Marriage to him. Doth not Union go before Justification? Remember I distinguished before *ex parte actus & ex parte objecti.*

Aphorism.

Page 288. *THis Accepting, which is a* Moral receiving, *doth not, nor possibly can make Christ ours immediately and properly, as it is a* receiving: *But mediately and improperly only; the formal cause of our interest, being God's* Donation *by the Gospel-Covenant.*

Animadvers.

Accepting is properly the receiving of a *thing offered*: And so our Accepting, presupposeth God's offer; our receiving, supposeth his Donation: And I should rather think that it is not God's offer and Donation, but our accepting and receiving, which doth immediately make Christ ours. The Gospel-Covenant is held out to many, who yet have no interest in Christ, because they have not faith to accept and receive him, *John* 1. 11,12. *Acts* 13. 38,39,40,41.

Reply.

Reply.

This is a point of greater moment than to all appears: But as to your Objection, it is of most facile solution. There are two acts of God's Donation to be distinguished, which you confound: 1. One is his *making* the *conditional Covenant* or *Gift*: This was a *natural act* past long ago, and our *Acceptance* supposeth it past. 2. The second is the *moral act* of this *Covenant*, *Deed of Gift*, or Law once made. This *moral action* is considerable, 1. As *before* our performance of the Condition; and that is imperfect, and properly no action, as to *giving*: For it is essential to a Condition, to *suspend* the act of the Law, Grant, or other instrumental Donation. 2. But when the *Condition is performed*, then the Law or Covenant doth *truly agere* or *significare*, and *give Christ* and *Righteousness*. For though the Instrument were in *being before*, yet it did not *agere vel efficere*, till the Condition was performed. And this is common in moral Action or Efficiency, to delay so long, and begin on such terms: And the reason is, because all its force for Action is from the *Will* of the *Law-giver* or *Donor*: For it worketh but as *signum voluntatis ejus*. Now it is *his Will* that a conditional Grant shall not act, or be effectual till the Condition be performed, and therefore it cannot before. If a man make a *Testament*, giving so much to such a Son when he marrieth, and so much to another on such a *Condition* (as if it were but *thankful Acceptance*) this *Testament* will *not give* them any *actual right*, till the *Condition* be performed. So I answer you; Our *Acceptance* supposeth *God's Grant*, as made in the *Instrument*, and supposeth it *conditionally* to be ours; but as truly supposeth,

poſeth, that *actually* it is *not ours* till *Acceptance*; the Law till then ſuſpending its act. Indeed if it had been an *abſolute Grant*, it had been otherwiſe: For then the receiving would have been neceſſary only in natural, and not moral reſpect; and only *ad poſſeſſionem & non ad jus*. And yet ſome Grants uſe to be made in *phraſe* of *abſolute ones*, which yet imply *Conſent* or *Receiving* to be *conditional*, becauſe it is ſeldom convenient to make over any gift upon other terms: (Yet ſometimes it is.) Can you think indeed (as you ſeem to intend) that all God's Agency is paſt before we believe, and that he doth nothing after? Why then he juſtifieth men before Faith *ex parte ſui*, as fully as after; and the Reprobate as fully as the Elect: But both theſe are falſe. Indeed God doth no natural action after (it is *ex vi Legiſlationis*, that the *Law* doth ſtill afterward act) but the *moral act* of his Law, which is *debitum conſtituere*, *jus conferre*, is *after our Faith immediately*: and this is the act that we are chiefly to look at. You ſay, the Goſpel-Covenant is held out to Unbelievers, and what of that? Doth it therefore *give right in Chriſt to Unbelievers?* Or doth *Faith* it ſelf *give* that *right?* Or did God before give it *abſolutely*, and they only loſe the poſſeſſion for want of a Reception merely natural? No, none of all this.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. IF *the Covenant make Chriſt as King, the Object of that Faith which is its Condition,* * *as well as Chriſt as a Deliverer or Prieſt, then may it be as fit a* medium *for our Juſtification as the other.*

* *Viz.* Of Juſtification.

Anim.

Animadverſ.

It doth not follow, becauſe the Covenant extends to more than Juſtification; and Juſtification it ſelf requires that Chriſt be received as King, yet not that Juſtification may be obtained, but becauſe it is obtained.

Reply.

1. You might eaſily diſcern from what went before, that I ſpoke of the *Condition of Juſtification.*

2. I perceive now that you think the *receiving Chriſt as Prieſt*, and *as King*, are two diſtinct acts; and that the former alone juſtifieth us, not only without the other, as a *Condition*, but even without its *preſence*, which is but to *follow* becauſe we *are juſtified.* Contrary, He that receives not Chriſt as Chriſt, (that is, in all the eſſentials of his Mediatory Office) doth not receive him, ſo as to be juſtified by him. But he that receives him only as Prieſt, and not as King, doth not receive him as Chriſt; therefore, *&c.* The Scripture calleth him *Chriſt*, *the Anointed*, more fully and frequently, in reſpect to the Kingly part of his Office than any. A falſe Faith doth not juſtifie: But to receive Chriſt only as a Prieſt, and not as King, is a falſe Faith; therefore, *&c.* Again, He that knows not Chriſt to be the King of the Church by Office, and *de jure* the *Ruler* of his Soul, knows him not with a true knowledg (no more than he that knows not that a man hath a head, but only a heart, hath a true knowledg of man;) therefore ſo to receive him is no true receiving. And if he know him to be King, and yet receive him not as ſuch, then it is worſt of all. Laſtly, To receive Chriſt ſo as he was never offered, is no true receiving: But to receive him as Prieſt only, is ſo to receive him as he was never offered; there-

therefore, &c. And therefore this receiving which you ſpeak of doth not juſtifie.

Aphoriſm.

Page 289. I *Take it for granted, that Dr.* Downam's *Arguments in the place forecited, have proved* Affiance *to be but a fruit of the principal juſtifying act of Faith.*

Animadverſ.

I cannot examine thoſe Arguments, not having the Book wherein they are contained. But *Affiance* being taken for a Recumbency on Chriſt, it ſeems to be a principal part of juſtifying Faith, as being that which the phraſe of *Believing in Chriſt*, ſo frequent in Scripture doth import, and which is meant by *embracing*, Heb. 11.13.

Reply.

I am of your mind in all this: But withal, as *Acceptance* is the *moſt principal* act, and yet is a *fruit* of *Aſſent*: So *Affiance* may be a *principal act*, and yet be but a *fruit of Acceptance* or *Election*. And though [*believing in Chriſt*] imply *Affiance*, yet firſt it implieth *Aſſent* (of which *Downam* is large:) And though [*imbracing*] may include *Affiance*, yet firſt, and principally Acceptance, as is * evident.

* I ſhould have ſaid, that there is firſt Affiance on the Speakers Veracity in the Aſſent of Faith; and then a quieting Affiance in the Conſent, when it is ſtrong; and a practical Affiance, in venturing on the dangers and difficulties, and hoping for the reward.

Aphoriſm.

Page 291. I *Have earneſtly ſought the Lord's direction my knees, before I adventured on it.*

Animadverſ.

That may argue the ſincerity of your deſire, but not the ſucceſs of your endeavours.

Reply.

Concedo totum. You need not deny a Concluſion that was never inferr'd. Whether I have any better Argument for my ſucceſs, I leave you to conclude upon peruſal.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. *IF Faith juſtifie, as it is the fulfilling of the Condition of the New-Covenant, and Obedience be alſo part of that Condition; then Obedience muſt juſtifie in the ſame way as Faith.*

Animadverſ.

But I think it neither hath been, nor can be proved, that either Faith doth juſtifie, as it is the fulfilling of the Condition of the whole New-Covenant, which doth comprehend more in it than Juſtification; or that *Obedience* is part of the Condition of the New-Covenant, ſo far as it concerns Juſtification, I mean for the obtaining of it. Obedience is required indeed in the New-Covenant; but not that thereby we may be juſtified, but as a fruit of that Faith whereby we are juſtified.

Reply.

The firſt is yielded. You might eaſily know, that I ſpoke of the Condition of Juſtification: For the ſecond, it is alſo granted of Juſtification begun: But as for Juſtification continued, and conſummate by Sentence at Judgment, let it reſt on the proofs themſelves.

Aphoriſm.

Page 292. *THe plain expreſſion of St.* James *ſhould terrifie us from an Interpretation contradictory to the Text: And except apparent violence*

violence be used with his Chap. 2. 21, 24, 25. *it cannot be doubted, but that a man is justified by* Works, *and not by* Faith *only.*

Animadvers.

It cannot indeed be doubted, but that St. *James* doth say so: But the Question is not of his words, but of his meaning. And it may seem strange, that you should so censure that Interpretation, which is generally received by Protestants, as to make it contradictory to the Text. The Papists say as much about those words, [*This is my Body*;] and they have as much reason for what they say as you have, for any thing I can see. For the meaning of St. *James*, whom you think to be so clear and full for you, it's needless to shew what our Divines do say, even *Cajetan* himself upon the place saith, *Jacobus docet quod non fide sterili, sed fide fœcunda operibus Justificamur.* And this indeed seems to be S. *James*'s meaning by his whole Discourse, from *ver.* 14. to the end of the Chapter, where he bends himself against such as presume of Faith, though it be without Works, which Faith Protestants generally deny to be which justifieth. More especially consider, that St. *James* saith, *That* Abraham *was justified by works, when he had offered up his son upon the altar*: And that the Scripture was *fulfilled, which saith,* Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteousness*, v. 21, & 23. This clearly shews (methinks) that *Abraham* was only so justified by Works, and not by Faith only, as that he was justified, not by a barren and idle, but by a fruitful and working Faith, his Works shewed his Faith to be true justifying Faith indeed. For that [*Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for Righteousness*,] was said of him long before that he offered up *Isaac*, as the story in *Genesis* doth shew; and by those very words doth S. *Paul* prove that Justification is by Faith, and not by Works, *Rom.* 4. 3. Therefore when S. *James* saith, that by *Abraham*'s offering up of *Isaac*, that Scripture was fulfilled, I know not how it can be otherwise understood, than that thereby it did appear, that it was truly said of *Abraham, That he believed God*, &c. His willingness to obey God in so great a work, shewed that he believed indeed, and that his Faith was such, as whereby he was justified. So when St. *James* saith, That by Works *Abraham*'s Faith was made perfect; the meaning is, that his Works shewed his Faith to be perfect, that is, a true justifying Faith; even as God's strength is said to be made

perfect in our weakneſs, 2 *Cor.* 11. 9. *i.e* the greatneſs of his power is ſeen in our weakneſs: For it is certain, that our weakneſs can add nothing to God's power, though it may be an occaſion to draw it out, and to make it manifeſt.

Reply.

1. I believe when the Holy Ghoſt ſpeaks plainly, he means as he ſpeaks.

2. I would you had told me what Interpretation is ſo generally received. Surely I have read of divers Interpretations by Proteſtants, one contradicting what others maintain; and therefore they do not ſo generally hold to one. Some ſay, It ſpeaks of Juſtification *coram Deo*; ſome ſay, only *coram hominibus*; ſome, that it ſpeaks of the Juſtification of the *perſon*; others, only of the Juſtification of his *Faith*, &c.

3. To your *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*, I anſwered before. It were an odd thing, if when we bring the expreſs words of Scripture for any proof, it ſhould be put off by *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*; or, *Ego ſum Vitis*.

4. The words you cite, *verſ.* 21, 23. will not prove what you intend. For if it be meant of [*Juſtification immediately on our firſt believing*,] or our *Juſtification as begun* (which you ſtill inſiſt on) then how can *James* prove by Works many years after, that the Faith was fruitful, when he was firſt juſtified by it.

5. Indeed the words you cite, undeniably prove that *James* and you ſpeak not of one and the ſame Juſtification, or of Juſtification in the ſame ſenſe. For you ſpeak of it as *begun*, and *James* ſpeaks of it only as *continued* (Legal Juſtification I mean) upon the performance of that Obedience which is the ſecondary

secondary part of the Condition; and so he includeth also the Evangelical Justification, which I before described, as being the necessary *medium* for confirmation and continuation of the Legal. It is beyond doubt that *Abraham* was justified long before he offered up his Son. And this Work could be no Condition of that Justification which was past; and therefore *James* speaks not of that. And indeed how else could *James*'s Doctrine be reconciled with *Paul's*, or the truth, if it spoke of the *first*, or *begun Justification?* For that is before and without the very presence of all *external Works:* (you think, *before love to Christ*; and say, *All our Divines so hold:* and yet here you say, that Protestants generally deny that Faith which is *without Works* to justifie: But so do not I; therefore I give less to Works than you think Protestants do.) Except you will say (as *Grotius* doth, and I think in this truly) that *James* by Works means, *a disposition and resolution to obey*, as *still necessary* (implied in the taking Christ for King,) *and actual obedience when we are called to it.* For *Abraham* did not offer his son in Sacrifice, but by *attempting* it, and chearfully addressing himself to it, shewed his resolution to obey.

6. As for *Vers.* 23. which you urge, there is no necessity of your sense, nor is it much against what I say, if it be yielded. Either you think *James* by [*Fulfilled*] means, *quoad sensum verborum ut primò sunt enunciata:* (But that cannot be, because they were Historical, and therefore fulfilled as soon as spoken; and not Prophetical, to be fulfilled afterward:) Or else he useth the word *Fulfilled* less strictly, as referring to the Doctrine which that Historical Enunciation did contain, viz. [*That it*

was by believing God that Abraham *was juſtified*;] which (as *Grotius* truly notes) is ordinarily in the New-Teſtament the meaning of that word, [*That the Scripture may be fulfilled.*] And this muſt be the meaning here (for the Reaſon forementioned.) And then the ſenſe may be, 1. Either by way of *Interpretation*; q.d. [*In this ſenſe is this Scripture-Doctrine fulfilled*, Abraham *believed God, that is, He believed and obeyed alſo:*] Or it may be by way of *Conceſſion*; q.d. [*Yet the Scripture was fulfilled, which ſaith*, Abraham *believed*, &c. For *Faith* did juſtifie him, but not *only Faith.*]

7. For your Interpretation of *Verſ.* 22. it is only your Affirmation, and is as eaſily denied. Sure I am, that my Interpretation is true *quoad Doctrinam*, viz. That Faith is not only manifeſted perfect by Obedience, but that it is really perfected, 1. As the Tree is by bearing fruit. 2. As a Covenant or Promiſe is by performance (as a mans Bargain is perfected, when he hath done that which he thereby bound himſelf to do.) 3. As it hath *naturam medii, viz. Conditionis*, to the Continuation and Conſummation of Juſtification. 4. As it is part of that neceſſary matter (not neceſſary at the firſt moment of believing, but neceſſary afterward, when he is called to it) whereby he is to be juſtified againſt the Charge of *non*-performance of the New-Covenants Condition; even againſt the Accuſation of being an Unbeliever or Hypocrite. It cannot be denied, but thus far *following-Obedience perfecteth Faith:* And if this be true *doctrinally*, I ſee yet no reaſon, why I ſhould exclude all theſe from the meaning of the Apoſtle in that Text, or any of them; when the old Rule is, to expound Scrip-

ture

ture in the moſt comprehenſive ſenſe it will bear, and not to limit or reſtrain it without neceſſity.

8. Your own Interpretation and Mr. *Pembles*, granteth as much as I plead for, I think, if you contradict not your ſelf again: If by [*Works*,] you underſtand [*a working-Faith*,] it ſhall ſuffice me, if you apply it as *James* doth; that is, not to a mere *neceſſitas præſentiæ* of Works, but to that *Conducibility* to the effect, which *James* gives to both: Or (to ſpeak as others) not only to *Faith in it ſelf*, but to Faith *as working*. If [*a working Faith*] be made by God *the Condition* of *Juſtification*, then the *modus* or adjunct, [*Working*,] is a true, neceſſary, ſecondary part of the *Condition*, as the *Faith* it ſelf is the ſubſtance or principal part. As when God makes [*ſincere Faith*] the *Condition*, *Sincerity* is thereby made the *modus*, and ſo far a true part of the *Condition*. If you bargain to give me [*a ſound, ſwift, travelling Horſe*] on ſuch a price: You receive your money for him as really *quatenus ſound, ſwift*, &c. as *quatenus a Horſe*. If a Woman in Marriage covenant to be [*a faithful Wife*,] (and *not adulterous*) ſhe receives her intereſt in the Man and his Eſtate primarily *quatenus a Wife*, but alſo *quatenus faithful*; for want of which ſhe may be divorced after. In this ſenſe therefore I will not contend againſt you, if you yield, that *Faith* is the *Condition* of continued and conſummate Juſtification; not only conſidered *in ſe* as *Faith*, but alſo as *working*. But ſtill I ſay, I had rather ſtick to the Scripture-words, when I ſee no neceſſity to change them.

But now if Mr. *Pemble*, or you, or any, will ſay, [*Works juſtifie not the Perſon, but the Faith*,] you

ſay and unſay. It is a contradiction: For if it be true in all particular cauſes, that *Juſtificatio cauſæ eſt etiam Juſtificatio perſonæ* (as *Bradſhaw* tells you more fully, *de Juſtif. Edit. Lat.* c. 3. §. 9, 10. p. 30.) much more in ſuch a Juſtification as this, which Everlaſting Life dependeth on. If you be accuſed to be a final *non*-performer of the Conditions of the New-Covenant, he that juſtifieth your *performance*, juſtifieth *you* againſt *that Accuſation*, and hath no other way to juſtifie you. This Accuſation is, 1. Either that you are *an open Infidel:* Againſt this you muſt be juſtified, by producing *your Faith it ſelf.* 2. Or that you are a *Hypocrite*; that is, a *cloſe Unbeliever:* And ſo you muſt be juſtified *coram Deo*, by pleading the *ſincerity* of your Faith, and *coram hominibus conjecturaliter*, by producing *Works* as the fruits. 3. Or that you are but a *half-Believer*, or *half-Performer* of the *Conditions*; viz. One that took Chriſt for your own ends to ſave you, but not to *rule you*, (Luke 19. 27.) or that believed (in *James*'s ſenſe) but did not *obey:* Againſt this you muſt be juſtified by producing your *conſent* to *Chriſt's Rule*, and your *Obedience*. (And to this *James* had reſpect.) Or, 4. You are accuſed to be an *Apoſtate:* And againſt this you muſt be juſtified, by producing your *Perſeverance*. So that whatever part of the Condition you are accuſed to have violated, you muſt be juſtified, by proving the performance of that part. And this is *Juſtificatio perſonæ & non tantum cauſæ*. Nay, when you ſay, [*Works juſtifie our Faith,*] you plainly grant alſo, that they *juſtifie our Perſon*, when the caſe is, [*Whether we are true Believers or not?*] There is no way in this caſe (which will be the great caſe at the day of Judgment)

Judgment) to juſtifie the *Perſon*, but by juſtifying *his Faith*. And therefore I ſaid, that I diſliked not Mr. *Pembles* ſenſe as to what he affirmed, [*That we are juſtified by a working Faith:*] But as to the denial or recalling of the ſame again, in ſaying, [*We are not juſtified by Works*;] or, [*They juſtifie not the Perſon, but his Faith:*] For if Faith juſtifie not, only conſidered as *Faith*, but alſo as *working*, that is plainly as much as to ſay, *Secondarily* we are juſtified by *Works*, or *Working*, as *primarily* by *Believing*; And that Works juſtifie us, by the juſtifying of our Faith. For the Apoſtle ſaying, [*We are juſtified by Works, and not by Faith only,*] doth as plainly as can be ſpoken, give Works more than a compreſentiality, even a co-intereſt in the effect: For it cannot be ſaid, [*We are juſtified by Works,*] becauſe they are *preſent* only.

Aphoriſm.

Page 293. *THe Apoſtle doth profeſſedly exclude the Works of the Law only from Juſtification, but never at all the Works of the Goſpel, as they are the Conditions of the New-Covenant.*

Animadverſ.

1. All Works, if they be Good-works, are Works of the Law, *i. e.* Works which the Law requireth; the Law (I mean the Moral Law) being as to Works the eternal Rule of Righteouſneſs, there being no ſin, but that which is forbidden by the Law, and which is a tranſgreſſion of it, 1 *John* 3.4. And therefore that in the *Epheſ.* 5. 15. *See that ye walk circumſpectly*, or exactly, ἀκριβῶς, *Beza* doth well expound, *quam proximè ad Legis Dei præcepta.*

2. The Apoſtle doth ſimply and abſolutely exclude Works from Juſtification: For, 1. He ſheweth that *Abraham* was juſtified by Faith, and not by Works: Now *Abraham* did the Works of the Goſpel, as well as of the Law, yet was he not juſtified

justified by Works, but by Faith only. 2. He sheweth, that if a man be justified by Works, of what kind soever, his Justification is not of Grace, but of Debt. 3. To prove that a man is justified by Faith, and not by Works, he alledgeth the words of *David*, *Blessed is the man whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.* Now that must be understood of Works simply considered: For who doth any Works so, but that he hath need to have his iniquities forgiven, his sins covered, and not imputed to him? *Fræclare* Calvinus, (saith B. *Dav.* de Just. Act. c. 30. p. 394.) *seligat ex totâ suâ sanctus Dei servus, quod in ejus cursu maximè eximium se putabit edidisse, deprehendit alicubi quod carnis putredinem sapiat.*

Reply.

1. All Works are Works of *a Law*, but not [*the Law*] which the Apostle speaks of. The *Moral Law* distinct from the *Sanction* really, that is, as part of neither the Old Covenant or New, is a *non ens*, a *Chymæra*.

2. To your Reasons, that the Apostle excludes *all Works* simply and absolutely: I answer particularly; 1. He speaks only of *Justification coram Deo Legislatore veteris Legis*; and not of Justification against the *Accusation of final Unbelief*. 2. He speaks of Justification against a *true Charge*, which is the same with *Remission of sin*; and not of Justification against a *false Accusation*. 3. He speaks of *Works*, as *Competitors with Christ*; and not as *subordinate to him*. (*James* contrarily.) For the Question that *Paul* debates is, Whether we are justified by the Works of the Law, or by the Righteousness of Christ received by Faith? Where he principally in his Question opposeth *Works* and *Christ* as in point of *Merit*; and Faith is but collaterally put in the opposition. 4. He speaks against

Works

Works justifying meritoriously, and not as *Conditions* of the *continuance* of a free-given Righteousness. This I could bring multitudes of our Divines that affirm, that the Apostle speaking against *Justification by Works*, means in point of *Merit*; and that this is the Controversie between us and the Papists. 5. He doth so usually add, [*The Works of the Law*,] as if he had foreseen this Controversie, and of purpose let them know, that it is not *Obedience to the Redeemer* that he *excludes* from justifying as a *Condition*, in subordination to Christ; but Works done in Opposition, Competition or Co-ordination with Christ. 6. He expressly speaketh only of those Works which make the *Reward to be of Debt, and not of Grace*, and of no other. So much in general to be premised.

Now particularly to your first Argument, I say, 1. *Abraham's Gospel-works cannot* be set in competition with *Christ's Righteousness*, that is against their nature; and therefore could not so justifie: Which is all *Paul* says. But yet they might justifie as *Conditions under Christ*. 2. Your Conclusion unlimited, is expressly against the words of Scripture, *James* 2. 24.

To your second I answer, 1. There is no such words as yours, [*of what kind soever*,] either expressed or intimated by *Paul*. *To him that worketh*, in the sense *Paul* speaks of (that is, *ut operario*, to have the wages for the worth of the work) *the Reward is not of Grace, but of Debt*. 2. Else you fully do feign it, to contradict the whole scope of the Scripture, that promiseth the Reward to the Obedient. For the Apostle there speaketh of [*Working*,] and not only trusting in them; and he speaketh of the

the [*Reward*] and not only of *Justification* only. And do you think, that every man that obeyeth Christ, yea that obeyeth *præmii gratia*, doth make the Reward to be not of Grace? Then fair fall Antinomians and Rebels. 3. Faith is as truly a *Work*, as *Love* or *Hope*, &c. Yet it is not by *Paul* excluded; therefore not all *Works*.

I have followed this so far with another Reverend Brother, that I will say the less of it now. The two too common Answers are, 1. That this is *Bellarmine's* Answer; which I think not worthy a Reply. 2. That Faith justifies not as a Work, but as an Instrument. And so I say (more truly) Love, Hope, sincere Obedience, justifie not as Works, but as the Conditions on which God hath given the Confirmation, Continuation and Consummation of Justification. There is a third Answer of a Learned man, that *credere* is not *agere*, but *Pati*: But I think I have confuted that sufficiently.

3. To your third I say, 1. That plainly shews that *Paul* speaks only of the Justification I first mentioned. 2. We have need of pardon for the imperfection of Faith, Love, and every Work; therefore we have need to be justified *coram Deo Legislatore Legis operum*, by *Remission of sins* through the *Sacrifice of Christ*: This is all your words will conclude, or *Paul* intends; and this is easily granted, and I hope should be faithfully maintained against any Adversary, if there were occasion. But, 4. We need not pardon for performing the Conditions of the New-Covenant; not for *being Believers*, loving Christ, obeying, *&c.* but only for doing it *no better*. 5. If this be your Argument, [*Whatsoever Work is imperfect, and needeth pardon, cannot justifie*, &c.] I answer,

answer, By way of *Merit* it cannot: But as a *Condition* of *free-given Pardon*, an *imperfect* work may justifie; or else Faith could not. To *Calvin*'s words and *Davenants*, I willingly subscribe.

Aphorism.

Pag. 297. *For Mr. Pemble's Interpretation, that by* [Works,] *is meant* [*a working* Faith.] *I answer, I dare not teach the Holy Ghost to speak, nor force the Scripture, nor raise an Interpretation so far from the plain importance of the words*, &c.

Mr. *W. Thomas* Answer to *Speed*, saith not amiss, that [by *Faith we are justified*, as *sinners*; and by *Works* as *Believers*:] Though the matter require more for its Explication.

Animadverf.

1. All this is no more than the Papists object against the Exposition of those words, *This is my Body.*

2. That all this, or any part of it, doth follow on the admitting of Mr. *Pemble*'s Exposition (which as I have shewed, is no other than that which *Cajetan* doth imbrace) is only supposed, but not proved. We do not teach the Holy Ghost to speak, nor force Scripture, nor raise an Exposition far from the importance of the words, when we interpret Scripture by Scripture, and shew the meaning of one place by another, yea the meaning of a place by the very circumstances of it.

Reply.

It is not Mr. *Pemble*'s *inclusion*, but *exclusion*, that, as I shewed you, I speak of. And it is an ill way to interpret Scripture, by *denying* it: When you prove your Interpretation (in the point opposed) indeed by any other Scripture, or the circumstances of this, you will do more, I think, than I have yet seen done. But it is very easie to feign or suppose an Analysis according to our own conceit, and thence to force a sense on each particular Verse.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *But when it is the very scope of a Chapter in plain and frequent Expressions, no whit dissonant from any other Scripture, I think he that may so wrest it, as to make it unsay what it saith, may as well make him a Creed of his own, let the Scripture say what it will to the contrary.*

Animadvers.

Still you suppose much, but prove nothing. I have shewed before, that the scope of the Chapter is not against Mr. *Pemble*'s Interpretation, but for it: And that to interpret as you do, is repugnant both to some passages in that Chapter, and also to other places of Scripture.

Reply.

1. Let your proofs prevail according to their strength: I leave it to the trial. 2. For my proofs, I know not well what to offer as such: For if I bring plain Scripture, it is easie to say, It means not as it speaks, and to feign an Analytical Reason of it. But I prove, that by [*Works*] *James* means [*Works*] indeed.

1. The unprofitableness of bare Faith, (that is, *Assent*) without *Works* (Works in a proper sense) is made the subject of his Discourse, *Vers.* 14. It is not *Faith* and *Faith* that are opposed, but *Faith alone*, and *Faith and Works*: Insomuch that he concludes, *Faith cannot save him that hath not Works*: Which plainly intimates a necessity of more in *Works* than their bare *presence*.

2. His first Argument *ab inefficacia similis*, is, *Good words*, without *good deeds* cannot feed or clothe men: So belief without a *good life*, cannot please God, and save the person, but as to *this use* is dead, being alone. Here again, the opposition is not merely

merely between Faith and Faith, but between *ſingle Faith of Aſſent*, and *Faith and Works together*. And ſtill the ſame kind of force (I am loth to call it efficacy) is aſcribed to Works, in their place, as to Faith.

3. His ſecond Argument is, That to have Faith without Works is a hardning of thoſe that are Unbelievers, and cauſeth them to think ill of the Chriſtian Faith, and inſult over it, *verſ.* 18. *q. d.* A man (that is, an Unbeliever) may ſay, *Thou haſt Faith*, (*i. e.* You ſay none are of the true Religion but you; your Faith only is right, and we are all wrong; but *ſhew me thy Faith by thy Works*; (i.e. If your belief be ſo good, why have you no better lives? it appears by your Works, what your Belief is:) And *I will ſhew thee my Faith by my Works*; *i. e.* Let our Works ſhew which of us hath the beſt Belief.

4. His third Argument is, that the *Devils* have a true Belief without Works; therefore that will not ſave, *verſ.* 19. *q. d.* Thou haſt no more than Devils have, if this be all.

5. His fourth Argument is *verſ.* 21. and the Concluſion premiſed, *verſ.* 20. viz. *Faith without Works is dead*, viz. As to the *effect of juſtifying and ſaving* (*mortuum & inutile in Lege æquiparantur :*) Still here the oppoſite part on one ſide, is [*Faith and Works*;] and on the other [*Faith without Works.*] The Argument, *verſ.* 21. is *Abraham* himſelf (that is ſaid to be juſtified by Faith) was yet *juſtified by Works* (not only by that Faith which did work, but *by Works*) and the Work is expreſſed [*when he offered his ſon on the Altar.*]

In

In *Verſ.* 22. he urgeth the Application, *Seeſt thou not how Faith wrought with his Works*; i. e. He both believed and obeyed, his Faith and Obedience did co-work; or (if you will, that his Faith produced Works) and [*by Works was Faith made perfect*;] (*i. e.* by thoſe Works which it produced, or he added, Faith was made perfect for the accompliſhing of its ends, to which elſe it was dead, as is oft ſaid before: Perfect and Dead are oppoſed; Dead is inſufficient to the ends.)

6. In *verſ.* 23. he for preventing an Objection, [*Was not* Abraham *juſtified by Faith?*] interpreteth that ſaying, [*The Scripture was fulfilled which ſaith*, &c. (*q. d.* He was indeed juſtified by Faith, the Scripture is fulfilled in that: But when he was called to *Works*, it was not then by *Faith alone*, but by *Faith and Works* added (for though *Faith* be the *Condition of Initiation*, yet *Faith and Obedience*, of the *Confirmation*, *Continuation* and *Conſummation* of Righteouſneſs.)

7. In *Verſ.* 24. He very ſolemnly calls them to obſerve the Queſtion concluded from this Argument, [*You ſee then how that by Works a man is juſtified, and not by Faith only:*] Not by that *Faith* only which *did work*; but by *Works* (as he had oft ſaid before) *not Works* neceſſary *as ſigns*, or as *idle Concomitants*, but [*by Works he was juſtified:*] And leſt we ſhould doubt whether he only require their preſence, and not their conditional intereſt, he ſhews their intereſt to be of the ſame nature, though not of the ſame order and degree as Faith's intereſt is, by applying the word [*By*] to the ſeveral members [*By Works, and not only by Faith:*] And puts μόνον *ſolum*, leſt if he had put it *adjectively*, it might occaſion the contrary

trary Interpretation. And he saith not, [*Faith is justified,*] but [*a man is justified.*] So that they that say he speaks of the Justification of *Faith*, must make it run thus, [*You see that by Works a mans Faith is justified, and not by Faith only.*]

8. His fifth Argument he urgeth from the example of *Rahab*. *Rahab* was justified *by Works* (still retaining and inculcating the same words of being *justified by Works*, and not only by *the Faith* which produceth them; lest if he speak it but *once*, we might think it were not his *proper meaning*: And so expresseth the *particular Work* by which the Scripture commendeth *Rahab*, as being one of those Works that justifie her.

9. And so he concludeth again, *Vers.* 26. That as the *Body without the Spirit*, *so Faith* (i. e. *A sound Orthodox Belief*: For so our Divines against the Papists and Commentators usually interpret it) *without works* (to second it, and joyn with it, as part of the Condition of continued Justification and Salvation) is *dead also* (*i. e.* is *unprofitable.*)

I have laid by all Authors, and the remembrance of their judgments, as much as I could, and looked only on the words of the Text, and charged my Conscience to speak what seemed the true unforced Analysis: And this is it that seems to me to be the naked sense. But when I had done, and reviewed the sense of Expositors, I see no reason to change it.

Now if (as I have said) *Piscator*, *Pemble*, &c. by [*working Faith,*] mean not only [*Faith it self as Faith,*] but [*Faith as working,*] i. e. *first as Faith, and secondarily as Working*, they say as much as I (but yet I will not accuse or refuse this oft repeated

Scripture-phraſe: But if they mean by [*working Faith*,] only [*that Faith which hath Works as only* quoad præſentiam *neceſſary*, and not at all *ad effectum Juſtificationis*,] I think they utterly forſake plain Scripture-words and ſenſe.

Aphoriſm.

Page 299. *They think that Faith is an inſtrumental efficient Cauſe of our Juſtification (which that properly it is not I have proved before) when if they underſtood that it juſtifieth but as* à cauſa ſine qua non, *or Condition, they would eaſily yield that Works do ſo too.*

Animadverſ.

1. Do you think that neither Mr. *Pemble*, nor *Calvin*, nor any of all thoſe eminent Divines whom you oppoſe, did underſtand the nature and uſe of Faith in the point of Juſtification?

2. Let Faith be either an Inſtrument, as many term it (and I have before noted the reaſon, as I conceive it:) or a Condition, as *you will have it* (*and I am not againſt it*) yet Faith doth juſtifie as it apprehendeth Chriſt's Satisfaction; by which indeed ſo apprehended, we are juſtified. Works do not concur with Faith in this act of apprehending Chriſt's Satisfaction; and therefore neither are they concurrent unto Juſtification.

Reply.

1. I confeſs you have me now at a diſadvantage. I ſhall not eaſily rid my hands of this Platonick Argument, though the Logick of it may be well enough dealt with. If I ſay that *Calvin*, &c. knew not ſo much as I, it will ſeem Arrogancy: If I ſay they did know more in this, I ſeem to confeſs my ſelf to err. But what if I ſpeak freely what I think without diſſembling, let it ſeem what it will? I think for the ſervice *Calvin* and ſuch others did the Church, and for the progreſs that Truth made by their

their endeavours, it was such, that I deserve not to be named the same day with them: I think also that *Calvin* brought in more New-Doctrines (new to those times) than I have done incomparably: I think also that he writes so moderately oft of this very point, that I think his judgment was in sense, in the main, the same with mine. Yet I think his apprehensions of the Doctrines now in dispute, and his expressions of them, were not so clear, distinct and orderly, but that some that come after may see further, and redress those oversights, which have occasioned quarrels since (when, as Dr. *Stoughton* saith, *We differ but in words about Justification by Faith, not understanding each others meaning. Form of wholesom words.*) And I will not be so ungrateful to God, for fear of seeming arrogant, as not to speak plainly, that I hope God hath shewed me somewhat further in this point, and some others, than *Calvin* hath taught or discovered. (And yet I think few of his *nearer* followers saw so much as he; but *most* depraved his Doctrine by out-going him, while they thought they did but imitate or vindicate him.) I hope when the Master-workman hath built the House, his Boy may say, without the imputation of Arrogancy, I have driven two or three pins which my Master oversaw.

But if this free Answer will not serve, I will answer as I have learned: I also will ask of you a Question or two. And when you have answered me, I will answer you.

1. Do you think that neither *Clem. Roman. Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clem. Alexand. Tatianus, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Lactantius, Cyril*, &c. nor any one Divine for a thousand

years after *Paul*, did understand his Doctrine, or know how Faith justified, or how far Works did concur? And you cannot but know (that are a man of reading) that they give generally as much, and mostly more to Works than ever I did, and that they teach our Justification by Faith to be as by Condition, and not as by an Instrument (whatever forced scraps some may gather out of a line, against the full scope of the whole page or Book.)

2. Do you think that *Calvin*, *Martyr*, *Chamier*, &c. with the stream of great renowned Forreign Divines (specially the first Reformers) did none of them know *what justifying Faith was?* that which we think our Children should know by their Catechism? which we think is so near the foundation? And yet did these men take justifying Faith to be either *Assurance* or *Perswasion* of the *pardon of a mans own sins in particular*; and say, He that had not this *Certainty* or *Perswasion*, had no Faith; and even lay a mighty part of Doctrinal Reformation, and difference between us and the Papists in this? And yet almost all our English Divines (except Antinomians) and most others, do now generally disclaim that Doctrine as erroneous, and place justifying Faith in Affiance, Recumbency, Assent or Acceptance, &c. confessing that *Assurance*, yea, and that *perswasion*, to be a separable fruit. Was it the former or the present Divines that knew not what justifying Faith is? Indeed if this way of arguing were good, you might save all your other Arguments through your whole Animadvertions, and carry all with this one Question: [Do you think I understand not the nature and use of Faith in Justification?] For I reverence your under-

understanding as much as some of theirs at least.

2. But your next words indeed concern the heart of our Controversie; and if I mistake not, do discover the main part of your mistake, and withal do contradict themselves.

You grant that Faith is a *Condition*, and (elsewhere) that it justifieth *as a Condition*; yet you say, it Justifieth, as it *apprehendeth Christ's Satisfaction*, by which indeed so apprehended, we are justified. But,

1. If by [*Apprehending*,] you mean [*Acceptance*,] and not mere *Assent* to the truth of the Gospel revealing Christ's Satisfaction, I then say, that this is a very great mistake: For it is *Christ himself*, and not his *Satisfaction*, that is the *adequate Object* of the *compleat act* of *justifying Faith*, that is, the *Wills act*: It is *Christ himself* that is *offered to us* to be our *Head*, *Husband*, *Lord*, *Saviour*, and by *accepting him*, the *Covenant* is made, and we are *united to him*: And this *Union* is the first effect of *this Faith*, and then *Justification* in order of nature follows as a *benefit*: As the Honours and Dowry go with the person in Marriage. Not that there needs another act of Faith to *justifie us*, after that the first hath *united us* to Christ. No: It is one act of Faith which is *uniting*, *justifying*, *adopting*, &c. they are several *relative effects* resulting from the *Covenant-grant*, upon our *first believing* (which is the *Condition*.) It is to *God* that Christ's *Satisfaction* is *given*, and to us *Christ himself*, and the *fruits* of it: It is too grosse a conceit, that only the *apprehension* of Satisfaction it self, or *Righteousness* either, should be the *justifying Act*: As if you should say, *A Womans apprehension* of her *Husbands Riches*, is it that

makes her *rich*, when it is her *Consent* to have the *man*. And a dangerous Doctrine this is to be preached to our sensual people, who are contented to have *Christ's Satisfaction* (as you speak) or *Righteousness*, but not himself in the state he is offered: This turns mens thoughts from Christ himself, with whom they must first close in Marriage-Covenant, before they shall have any Righteousness by his Satisfaction.

2. You seem to conceive that Faith justifieth *modo Physico, & non Politico vel Morali*: That as a man that takes money in his hand, doth thereby *physically receive* it, so he that takes Christ's Satisfaction or Righteousness, doth physically receive it. Which is too gross. For, 1. The Question is of our obtaining *Right*, and not *Possession*: And no *physical Apprehension* as such, gives *Right*. 2. *Recipere est pati, sed credere est agere; ergo credere est tantum receptio imputativa*. 3. Christ's *Satisfaction* or Righteousness is not an Object capable of our physical Reception. 4. Yet a *physical Reception* of *Righteousness* there is, imperfectly called so, even as all *Relations* are *received*; and which is nothing but *Justificari*, Passive Justification: But this follows Faith. *Credere & Justificari non sunt idem: Credimus enim ad Justificationem.*

3. The Controversie between us must lie here: Whether the *formalis vel proxima ratio* of Faith's interest in our Justification, be its *Apprehensive Nature*, or *its Office of Conditionality?* The *Nature* of Faith it self? or that it is the *Condition* to which the free Donor hath annexed Justification? For *Apprehendere Christum* I confess to be the *Nature* of Faith. Now I say (and say more confidently than ever, having tried the strength of many against it)

that

that *Apprehendere vel Acceptare Christum* being *ipsa fidei essentia*, is but the *matter* that hath interest, and not the *ratio formalis* of *Faith's interest* in our *Justification*. It is but the *aptitudo ad officium*, and the *Conditionality* (if I may so call it) is the *Office* it self. *That Faith* which doth *accept Christ*, doth justifie, and *materialiter thereby*: But not *as it accepteth Christ*. The word [*As*, *quatenus*] should strictly speak only the *formal Reason*: And so Faith justifieth only as *a Condition*, appointed thereto by God. But if any should extend it improperly to the *ratio aptitudinalis*, then I would yield to them, that Faith justifies as it accepteth Christ. For no other way of Participation was so fitted to the nature of the *Recipient* and *Receptum*.

1. The *Nature* of Faith it self (which is *acceptare Christum*) goes in order of Nature *before* its *Conditionality*: It is therefore apparent, that the act is but the *materia apta*, and the *Conditionality* is the superadded *formalis ratio*.

2. If *Faith as Faith*, justifie, that is, as *acceptatio Christi*, then *omnis acceptatio*, *& sola*, *& semper*; then the Consequence would proceed directly and necessarily *ex se* [*I have accepted Christ*, *therefore I am justified*:] But that it will not do. For, 1. He is ours, as *given* directly; that is, the efficient cause of our right to him. Had we taken him, or performed that same act which we call Apprehension without *Gift*, it had conveyed no right. 2. And (if you say, that, at least, *omnis apprehensio Christi dati* doth justifie *qua apprehensio*;) I must add, That if Christ had been given by an *absolute Promise* or *Gift*, our apprehension of him would not have justified; but we should have been justified *before* it,

or *without* it. As if a man by Testament give his Lands to his Son that is a thousand miles distant, and knows nothing of it, the right is his before his knowledg or consent, though he may afterward dispossess himself of it when he will. If a King will confer any Honour on a man absent, or an Infant, he may do it, and they partake of the Honour, without their own knowledg or consent. And when they do *know* and *consent*, that gives not the Honour or Title which they had before. If God had pleased to say, [I will give my Son and his Righteousness to such *Infants*, *Ideots*, *Indians*, though they never hear of him; or absolutely to say, [*I will pardon all their sins*,] they had been justified and pardoned thereby without Faith: If the Promise were not *conditional* (expressly or implicitely) no mans Faith could justifie him. As it belongeth to the *Legislator per præceptum constituere Debitum officii*, and without Precept (natural or superadded) duty, would be no duty: So it belongs to the *Legislator* or *Donor*, as *Dominus præmii* (and in our case *Dominus præmiati*) to institute the *Conditions* on which it shall be obtained; and therefore it is not from the *essential nature* of the *act of Faith* it self. The benefit to be received was wholly God's before the giving; therefore it cannot be conveyed any way, but by the mere signification of God's will: What way is then to alienate a Propriety freely, or to confer right to a benefit on another, but by signifying the Donors will? that is, by giving, selling, &c. Now therefore no act of ours can confer to us the right to anothers benefits; that were to give them to our selves before we have them. All that our act can do, is to be the *Condition* of the Gift; that is, an act

act which it pleaſeth the Donor ſo to require of us, if we will have his Gift, that he will ſuſpend his Donation thereon; ſo that when we perform it, we ſhall have it, and not without it. Seeing therefore that the Will of the Donor as Donor, doth all in Alienation of his own, or in conveying right to his benefits; therefore no act of the Receivers as an act, or ſuch an act directly, can do it: For from his Will muſt the Receivers act have its moſt immediate formal intereſt: Now the *Natura fidei apprehenſiva*, is not from God as *Legiſlator* of the *New Law* or *Teſtament*, and as *Donor of Chriſt* and *Juſtification*; but from God as *Creator* or *Producer* of that *Act in the Soul*, or by it. But the conſtituting the *Condition* is *God's act as Donor* of that very *Benefit*, or as *Legiſlator*. That which I mainly therefore inſiſt on is this: Call Faith an Inſtrument, or an Apprehenſion, or what you will, as long as you mean but the *nature of the Act or Habit*, it doth not *juſtifie proprie & proximè qua talis*, that is, but the *materia apta*; but the *formalis ratio* of its juſtifying intereſt, is *quâ conditio fœderis*: And therefore whatſoever is ſuch a Condition of Juſtification doth juſtifie.

One while the Condition was not the ſame as now it is, and yet it then juſtified. The World before Chriſt was not bound to believe that this Jeſus was the Chriſt, that he was born of a Virgin, crucified, dead, buried, riſen, *&c.* but only that Chriſt who ſhould come, ſhould do thus (and it may ſeem that the Diſciples before Chriſt's Reſurrection, believed not that neither:) But if we believe not that this Jeſus is he, we ſhall die in our ſins. Faith cannot therefore juſtifie *proximè & formaliter ex natura actus*,

actus, when it hath been so changed; and yet whatsoever was the Condition, still justified.

Besides, you contradict this your self, by acknowledging that Faith justifieth *as a Condition* of *Justification*. For then certainly it cannot justifie *proximè*, as it is *apprehensio*, that is, *qua fides*. For, 1. The *Conditionality* cannot be the *matter* and the *nature* of the Act, the super-added *form*, but contrary. For the *Conditionality* supposeth the *nature* of the Act, and not, the nature of the Act supposes it to be the Condition. 2. It is not possible that both should be *proximæ vel formalis rationes*: It must be but one. 3. It is impossible, if Faith be a *Condition*, but that it should justifie *quâ conditio*; and it is impossible, if it justifie *as a Condition*, but that should be its neareſt Reason. To say, [the Sun is *causa efficiens* of *Light*; and yet that it produceth not Light *qua causa efficiens*, or yet that there is some nearer Reason; were not so absurd as to say, *Faith is a Condition*, and yet either justifieth not *quâ conditio*, or yet hath some more formal Reason. But I have by so many Arguments lately to another Brother, confuted this Opinion, [that Faith justifies *ex natura actus*, viz. *ut apprehensio Christi, vel ut fides, & ut conditio naturalis, & non ut conditio moralis*] that I must now thus dismiss it.

If you say, that you do not mean, that *Faith is Faith*, or *ex natura actus* justifieth, but *ex natura objecti*. I answer, 1. Our Question is not, Whether Christ justifie? if that be it, we are agreed: I do not think when you say, Faith is an Apprehension of *Christ*, or a *Condition*, that you mean [Christ *justifies as an Apprehension of Christ, or a Condition*:] The Question is therefore of *Faith's* interest, and not

not of *Christ's*. 2. The Object gives not a justifying force to the act. 3. The root still of all the mistakes lieth, in having thoughts of this moral Conveyance of Right, as if it were a physical Communication of some Substance or Quality. The receiving of fire burns my hand *ex naturâ objecti*, and my act of Approximation, or taking it into my hand, is *conditio naturalis (impropriè dicta conditio:)* But in conveying Rights (as in Marriage, Testaments, and all Contracts, &c.) the *Right* must be first conveyed by *moral means*, before the *Object* can put forth its power. Christ is not yours, because he is Christ, nor yours because you apprehend him (speaking of the neareſt Reason;) but yours, because God hath *given him*; and yours upon *believing*, rather than on any other terms, because God hath given him to you, *if you believe*, rather than on other terms. If God had said, some other act should be the Condition, it should have justified, as truly Faith now doth.

And therefore for your Argument, [*Works concur not with Faith in apprehinding; therefore neither in justifying.*] I deny your Consequence, having first denied your ground: For, *fides non quà fides justificat, sed quà conditio præstita.* And I argue contrarily, Repentance and Obedience to the Lord that bought us, do concur with Faith in being *Conditions* of continued and consummate Justification; therefore they concur in justifying. (Yet I had rather say, [*We are justified by Faith,*] as signifying only a Conditionality, and being a Scripture-phase; than that [*Faith justifieth,*] as importing more a *Causality*, and being no *Scripture-phrase.*)

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 300. *When it is said, that we are justified by Works, the word* [By] *implieth more than an idle Concomitancy: If they only stood by while Faith doth all, it could not be said, that we are justified by Works.*

Animadverſ.

1. All this proves not, that by *Works* in St. *James*, is not meant [*a working Faith.*] Or that when he saith, that a man is justified by Works, and not by Faith only, his meaning is not, that a man is justified by such a Faith, as doth shew forth it self by Works, and not by a barren Faith, which hath no Works flowing from it.

2. [Faith alone (*saith Dr.* Preston) justifieth, but it is effectual and working Faith, and Works follow Faith necessarily. And there is a double Justification: One of the person, which is by Faith only, whereof St. *Paul* disputes, *Rom.* 4. the other of the Faith, which by Works must be shewed to be lively and effectual, as St. *James* disputes, *chap.* 2. Works justified *Abraham* that he was no Hypocrite (*i. e.* they shewed his Faith to be unfeigned, as the Apostle sheweth Faith must be, 1. *Tim.* 1. 5.) and Faith, that he was not a sinner, because by Faith Righteousness was imputed to him.] So he.

Reply.

1. No wonder: for it is brought to another end, than to prove that by Works, is meant Works.

2. What will you take for proof? If I should find the most expresse words for it, I think they may have another sense put on them as fairly as these.

3. I think the proof lieth on your part (which I see not performed:) For if I shew you where the Scripture saith, [*We are justified by Works, and not by Faith only:*] If you say, by *Works* is not meant *Works*, you must prove it. Because the plain sense is not to be forsaken without *cause*, and therefore he that doth it, must shew good cause for it.

4. But

4. But yet I will tell you what goes with me for proof (that by Works is meant *Works*, and not only the *Faith* which *doth work*) till I hear better proof of the contrary.

1. *James* calls them by the name of [*Works*] *twelve times* in thirteen Verses, and never by the name of [*working Faith*,] or, [*that Faith which worketh:*] A repetition not usual in Scripture, specially on such a subject: As if he had purposely done it to make men believe, that he means as he speaks; and therefore I think by [*Works*] he means [*Works.*] For obscure figurative speeches are usually but seldom, in comparison of the plain ones, and sufficiently evinced to be such by the more plain.

2. I am yet the more perswaded, that by [*Works*] is meant [*Works,*] because it is still opposed to [*Faith without Works,*] or, [*Faith alone,*] and not to [*this or that sort of Faith, viz.* that Faith which is not of a quality to Work,] though I doubt not but that is part of the Apostle's sense, in this term [*Faith,*] yet it is but part: For it is not only [*the Faith alone, without a working disposition,*] but [*Faith alone without Works themselves,*] when there is opportunity: The word [*Alone*] excluding Works themselves, as well as the *working disposition.* So that if I will wrest the word [*Works*] twelve times together to a strange sense, I must needs use the same violence with the word [*Faith alone*] also. Should I again run over each Verse, it is easie to manifest, that the opposition is not only between [*a Faith disposed to Work,* and a *Faith not disposed;*] but between [*Faith alone,*] and [*Faith and Works themselves together:*] Though yet the *conatus*

is

is the *work*, where no more is required, as in *Abraham's* case.

3. Particularly the Argument *à simili*, in *v.* 15,16. proves it: For the Argument is, *As merciful words do not profit the naked and hungry without clothes and food, so a good Belief will not justifie and save you, without Works.* Now it is not a *disposition* to *feed* and *clothe* that profiteth the hungry and naked: So neither is it a mere *disposition* to work, that is meant by Works.

4. The same is manifest in *Vers.* 13. where the occasion of all this discourse is begun, in the necessity of mercy, such mercy as men partake of from us.

5. I am the more confirmed, when I consider, that the death of Faith without Works here, *v.*20, 14, 26,24. is not merely the hypocrisie or seemingness of it: (He likeneth it to the real Faith of the Devils,) but the *inutility* of it as to justifie and save; (for justifying and saving Faith are all one with *James*, vers. 14,21,24.)

6. And *Vers.*18. by [*Works*] must needs be meant [*Works*;] else it would run thus, [*Thou hast Faith undisposed to Work, and I have a working Faith: Shew me thy non-working Faith without thy working Faith, and I will shew thee my working Faith by my working Faith.*] I had rather understand *James* plainly, than take him to speak such non-sense: And if you will take *Faith* and *Works* in the plain proper sense in this Verse, why not in the rest?

7. And in *Vers.* 20. *Works* must needs mean *Works*; else it must run thus, [*Faith without a working Faith is dead.*]

8. And

8. And so must it be *Vers.* 22. else it must run thus, [*Faith wrought with his working Faith, and by a working Faith was Faith made perfect,*] nay, [*a non-working Faith was made perfect.*]

9. So *Vers.* 24. else it must be thus, [*By a working Faith a man is justified, and not by a non-working Faith only:*] As if a *non-working* Faith did partly justifie. (For I hope you will not turn *solum* to *solam.*)

10. So *Ver.* 26. according to your way it must run, [*So a non-working Faith, without a working Faith is dead also.*] Let him that can, receive this Exposition, for I cannot.

11. But my chief Argument lieth in the great necessity of Works which the Apostle asserteth, both to Justification and Salvation. Now if I meet with those that confess by *Works* is meant *Works*, I would desire to know the reason, Why Works with Faith are so necessary? If they do but by an idle Concomitancy stand by, what means *James* to say, *Can Faith save him? we are justified by Works: What profit*, &c. So I would demand of you, concerning the *working* of *Faith*. If you understand [*working Faith,*] so as to make *Faith* it self the primary part of the Condition, and *working* the secondary, then you yield all I desire: If you understand it so, as to confine it to [*the Faith which worketh,*] and exclude [*the Working*] from justifying and saving (for *James* joyns both together) then will you open this mystery to me, and tell me, whence or what is this necessity that Faith should be working? If you say, *Working is necessary to signifie Faith to be sincere.* I reply, 1. But the Apostle makes it necessary to *justifie* and *save*, and not only to *signifie*. The

Soul

Soul doth not only *signifie* the Body to be alive. 2. God needs no signs, and it is he that judgeth.

You will say, *It is not sincere without working.*

Reply. 1. It is a *real Faith*, such as the Devils have, nay it may be more, they may really consent, that Christ shall justifie and save them from Hell.

2. How comes its Sincerity to lie in its working Dispolition? The sincerity of Faith as a good Work, lieth in its conformity to the Precept: But that's not the Sincerity in question. The sincerity of Faith, as *justifying* and *saving*, lieth in its being really that Faith, to which as a Condition, Justification and Salvation are promised. Now if the New-Testament make not mere Faith, but *Faith working*, to be the *Condition* of Justification or Salvation, then Faith *as* working secondarily, must justifie and save. For if in any Covenant there be *an Act* with its *Qualification* required, as the *Condition*, then the *Qualification* is part of that *Condition* as well as the *Act*: For it hath the same *essence* herein. And to say, that working is part of the *Condition* of Justification and Salvation, and yet doth not *justifie* and *save quà conditio*, is a contradiction directly: As much as to say, It is a Condition, and not a Condition; for the form of the Condition, is in its connexive respect to the effect. As if you should say, [Such a thing is a cause efficient, but doth not *qua causa* produce the *effect*.]

If not only *fides qua fides*, but *qua operans*, be *necessary* to Justification and Salvation, then it must be necessary either as *a cause* (but that we all deny) or as a *mere sign*; (but that it cannot be, when it is *coram Deo*: and more is expressed fully in the Text) or else as *a Condition* (which is the truth, it is path-
my

my reach to find any other respect wherein its necessity should lie. Let them shew it that assert it.

As for them that say, It is but the *Declaration* of our Justification *before men*, that is here spoken of, and not *before God*; 1. I have said enough to them in that Aphorism. 2. I need not meddle with that to you, who own it not. 3. The same instances of *Abraham* and *Rahab* are produced, by which other Scriptures prove Justification by Faith before God. 4. The Justification here meant, is an Imputation of Righteousness, *vers.* 23. and that is by God, and *coram Deo*. 5. *Abraham*'s sacrificing his Son, would rather have *condemned* him *before men*. 6. It is such as the Scripture about Imputation was *fulfilled* in. 7. It is the same Justification as that by Faith is: For the Apostle saith, [*It is by Works, and not by Faith only*,] importing, it is *by Faith*, but not only by Faith. Now *coram hominibus* it is not by Faith it self at all (indeed by the *profession* of Faith it may be.) 8. The Apostle makes Faith without Works unprofitable *to save*, vers. 14. And is it before men, or by men only, that they *are saved*? 9. Men know not when we *work* from *sincere Faith*, and when not. 10. Men be none of our *Judges*, nor doth the Apostle discourse of so small a matter as our being judged by man: And yet this is the commonest Exposition. Thus I have told you, why I think by Works is meant *Works*: and why they justifie, and that *coram Deo*.

2. Now to Dr. *Prestons* saying, which I marvel that you could produce against your self so fully, and take no notice of it. Though I believe Dr. *Prestons* Notions were not so digested as they should be in the point of Justification, yet they were so clear

the nature of *juſtifying Faith* (above any man that I know of) that it hath maintained much ſoundneſs in his Doctrine in the point of Juſtification in moſt things (only the notion of an *Inſtrument* was not then queſtioned:) and therefore if you go once to Dr. *Preſton*, I know where your cauſe is. It ſeems you could not pick one ſaying out of him ſeeming for you, but what ſaith almoſt as much againſt you as I do. 1. I ſay as he, that *Faith alone juſtifieth*, ſpeaking of our *firſt*, or *begun Juſtification*, which makes a man *juſtum ex injuſto* (that *Works* never do.) 2. I ſay *Works follow Faith* neceſſarily. 3. This *twofold Juſtification* I maintain againſt you, which Dr. *Preſton* here maintaineth. 4. In the common ſenſe it may be ſaid, that one is *more fully Juſtificatio perſonæ* than the other: But then remember, 1. That both are yet moſt truly and properly *Juſtificationes perſonæ*, as *Bradſhaw* ſhews in the place before-cited. 2. And that Dr. *Preſton* confeſſeth it: For when he hath ſaid, that one is [*of the Faith,*] he yet adds, [*Works juſtified* Abraham *that he was no Hypocrite.*] *Sin* is it that is enquired after at the Bar of *the Law:* Only *one kind of ſin* is enquired after (as to *Condemnation*) at the Bar of the *New-Law*; that is, *Unbelief*, or *rejecting* the *Redeemer*, and recovering Grace. This *Unbelief* is either *open* (againſt the Accuſation of this, men are juſtified by Faith and Profeſſion; or *ſecret* (which is the Hypocriſie here mentioned) and againſt this Accuſation both *Faith* and *Works* juſtifie: (Of which I ſpoke fullier before.) When *Abraham* is accuſed of being but a *ſeeming* Believer, or a *mere Believer* without *Obedience*; and ſo, either of *not-performing*, or but *half-performing* the Condition of the New-

New-Covenant: Here there is no way in the World to justifie him, but by his *own Faith and Works*. I shall speak more of this yet anon.

Aphorism.

Page 300. *When the Apostle saith,* [by Works, and not by Faith only,] *he plainly makes them Concomitant in Procurement, or in that kind of Causality which they have: Specially seeing he saith, not as he is commonly interpreted,* [not by Faith which is alone,] but, [*not by Faith only.*]

Animadvers.

The Apostle cannot make Faith and Works concomitant in Procurement of Justification, seeing that *Abraham* was justified by Faith, as the Scripture cited by the Apostle doth shew long before, that his Faith did operate and shew forth it self by that Work which the Apostle mentioneth: Therefore by Works, and not by Faith only, must needs be as much, as [*not by Faith which is alone without Works:*] Which is also clear enough by the whole Series of the latter part of the Chapter, and namely by that, Vers. 17. *Even so Faith, if it hath not Works is dead, being alone.*

Reply.

I will not forsake the plain sense of the Text, till other kind of Arguments than these constrain me. 1. Do not you easily see, that your necessary Consequence is against your self and the truth, more than me, and hath indeed no necessity or verity. You speak of *Abraham*'s *first Justification*, and yet you say, it must needs be *by Faith, which is not alone without Works*. But *Abraham*'s *first Justification was by Faith alone without Works*. 2. Do not you see that you argue to no purpose, that [the Apostle cannot make Faith and Works concomitant in procurement of Justification, as continued and consummate, and sentential at Judgment, because *Abraham* was justified

before?] But was his *continued* and *sentential* Justification before? The Law doth still *moraliter agere*, and so still *Justificare*, and so doth God by his Law or Grant. So that it being *actus Legis*, the Law doth as properly justifie you *to day*, as it did the *first day*. And yet it requires *more Conditions* at your hand *to day*, than the first moment. I wait therefore for some proof of your Consequence, That *Abraham*'s Justification twenty years after his Conversion, cannot be by Works as part of the Condition of Continuance, because his Justification was begun without Works. 3. For your clear proof from the Series and *Vers.* 17. I see not the least shew of proof, much less clear, but against you.

Aphorism.

Ibid. HE *therefore saith*, [Faith is dead, being alone,] *because it is dead as to the use and purpose of justifying*——*And so Works make Faith alive, as to the Attainment of its ends of Justification.*

Animadvers.

1. Faith if it be alone without Works (*hoc est renuens operari*, as *Cajetan* doth well expres it,) cannot justifie, and so is dead as to the use and purpose of justifying. Yet do not Works therefore concur with Faith to Justification, nor are they *part* of the *Condition* required of us, that we may be justified.

2. Works do not properly *make* Faith alive, but only demonstrate it to be alive. Works are the effect of justifying Faith, and the effect cannot give life to the cause, but may evidence the life of it.

Reply.

1. You yield to my Exposition of [*Dead*;] viz. *non ut fides, sed ut medium*, that Works are part of the Condition; I doubt not to say, the Scriptures cited in the Aphorism fully prove.

2. You

2. You muſt know that thoſe words were miſ-written, or miſprinted: They ſhould be thus, [*And without Works, Faith is not alive*;] yet the words are true as they are. For by [*Faith*] I mean not, [*fidem qua fides*,] Works do not make Faith alive in it ſelf; but, [*fidem qua medium*:] And by [*Making alive*,] I mean not *efficienter*, but *conſtitutivè*. And ſo when a man hath a *Condition* to perform which hath two parts, when the firſt is performed, the performance of the ſecond part makes it to be ſufficient to the end; it makes it to be the *totum*, the Condition fully performed, and ſo alive or ſufficient *ut medium:* When without it, it would be but *pars*, and inſufficient.

3. To your Argument I grant all, and what the better are you? Works are the effect of Faith, and ſo they neither give life to Faith as Faith, nor to Faith as the cauſe of Works, nor yet to Faith as the Condition of our begun-Juſtification (becauſe ſo Faith is the whole Condition, as to external Works, though not as to the excluſion of Repentance, Knowledg or Love;) but as it is the *medium* or *Condition* of our *confirmed*, *continued*, *conſummate Juſtification*. Your *Fine* is the full Condition of firſt poſſeſſing a leaſed Tenement, but your *Rent* muſt be added to *continue* your Intereſt and Poſſeſſion (yet in our Caſe there is no *ratio petiti.*)

Aphoriſm.

Page 301. *When the Apoſtle ſaith, That Faith did work in and with his Works, it clearly aimeth at ſuch a working in and with us, as maketh them conjunct in the Work of juſtifying.*

Animadverſ.

1. Why you render συνεργεῖν to work in and with I know not, it ſignifieth only to work with.

2. The meaning of thoſe words cannot be, that Faith and Works work together unto Juſtification, or are conjunct (as you ſay) in the work of juſtifying; ſeeing the work there ſpecified, (viz. *Abrahams* offering of his Son) was long after Juſtification, which Faith alone had procured. I ſee no Reaſon therefore to diſlike *Calvin*'s Expoſition, *Fides dicitur cooperata fuiſſe operibus, quia non fuit otioſa.*

Reply.

1. I uſed thoſe words not as a mere Tranſlation, but as the Tranſlation [working with] & the Expoſition; as ſuppoſing that Faith was ſaid to work with Works, when it produced them, and ſo work'd in them; and ſo conſequently I thought they concurred to juſtifie, according to the next words, [*By Works Faith is made perfect.*] But ſeeing this Expoſition pleaſeth not (though it makes as much for you as your own) I let it go, and will not inſiſt on it.

2. I have ſhewed the invalidity of your Conſequence before, that [Faith and Works cannot concur to continued and conſummate Juſtification, becauſe we were at firſt juſtified by Faith alone.] When will you ſhew a word of Reaſon for that Conſequence?

3. For *Calvin*'s Expoſition: As you ſeem not to own it in the main, *viz.* [*That it is not Juſtification* coram Deo, *but* coram Hominibus *that is here meant:*] So I ſtick not much at this, though I think it very imperfect to ſay, that Faith is ſaid to *co-operate*, becauſe it is *not idle*. It might indeed be well ſaid to *operate*, becauſe it is not idle, or rather not to be idle, becauſe it worketh.

Aphor.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. *AND when he ſaith, [That Faith was made perfect by Works,] it is not (as they and others interpret it) only a manifeſting to be perfect: But as the Habit is perfected in its acts, becauſe they are the end to which it tendeth; and as Marriage is perfected* per congreſſum & procreationem, *or any Covenant when the Conditions are performed.*

Animadverſ.

Piſcator and *Pemble*, and others ſay, *It is*: You ſay, *It is not*: But their [*Yea,*] may ſtand againſt your [*Nay,*] for any thing I yet ſee. Their Expoſition is for phraſe agreeable to Scripture elſewhere, *viz.* 2 *Cor.* 12. 9. and for matter to the Context.

3. The habit of Faith hath no other immediate and elicit acts (that I know) beſides believing; and by believing we are juſtified, though not as it is our act, but in reſpect of its Object, Chriſt, whom Faith apprehendeth, and by whom ſo apprehended we are juſtified. Other Works proceed from Faith as the fruits of it, but they perfect Faith no otherwiſe, than by manifeſting the perfection of it; even as the fruit of a tree doth manifeſt, but not make the tree perfect. *Faith* (ſaith Dr. *Preſton*) *is made perfect by Works; namely, as an Artiſt is declared skilful by his artificial Work, or a tree by the fruit it bears; the ſap is the cauſe of the Goodneſs, the fruit the ſign.*

3. Marriage is a ſtate, which is conſummated *per congreſſum*, though there never be *pro creatio*: But what this makes for the illuſtrating of Faith's being made perfect by Works, I do not ſee.

4. Faith is not the Covenant, but a Condition of the Covenant, and therefore your laſt ſimilitude ſeems not *quadrare*.

Reply.

1. I magnifie their authority and worth: But whoſe Reaſons have more weight, I leave to others to judge as they ſee cauſe.

2. Your ſelf yield before, that it is *quoad uſum & finem*, and not *quoad naturam*, that Faith is ſaid to *be dead*; that is, *ut medium, non ut fides* (ſtill remembring that we ſpeak of *Aſſent:*) And why ſhould it not be ſo in this point of the *perfecting* of Faith? *viz. Works perfect it*, ut medium, non ut fides (as before.)

3. To whom was *Abraham*'s Faith *manifeſted* to be perfect? Not to *men*, that ſaw not his act, or at leaſt, ſaw not his Faith by it, or would rather *condemn* him: Not to *God*, to whom all things are *manifeſt*, though by an Anthropopathy he ſay, *Now I know that thou feareſt God*, &c.

4. To your ſecond I ſay, 1. That Faith hath *more acts* than one: Your ſelf before ſaid, *Three* at leaſt. 2. It's cloudy to ſay, [*Believing juſtifieth, but not as our act, but in reſpect of its Object, Chriſt*, &c.] For it is *neither:* But *qua conditio præſtita.* Why doth not the *Object* juſtifie without the *Act?* Is it becauſe God *could* not ſo order it, or becauſe he *would* not? Doubtleſs the latter: And therefore the *Donor's Will* only createth the formal intereſt of Faith in juſtifying: As the Holy Ghoſt giveth the *matter.* We know Chriſt is the *meritorious Cauſe*: But the Queſtion is, What intereſt or place *Faith* hath? Either it is *cauſa vel conditio:* For no doubt it is *medium Morale, & non tantum naturale* (as your words would inſinuate:) And I know not what *moral Medium* it can be elſe, but either *cauſa vel conditio:* I think it is no *proper Cauſe*, therefore a *Condition.* To ſay, [*It juſtifieth in reſpect to its Object,*] is to ſpeak darkneſs. Will *any reſpect* give it that intereſt? Hath not *Love, Joy*, &c. reſpect to Chriſt? Have not all Goſpel Ordinances reſpect

to him? *What respect* then is it? Either of a *Cause*, or a *Condition*, or somewhat. 3. I have shewed in how many *respects* Works do perfect Faith, besides *manifesting* it. Is mere *manifesting a saving means? James* saith, [*Can Faith save him?*] Yes, without *Manifestation*, if that were all: If the very manifesting be not part of the *Condition* of Salvation. Works perfect Faith *ut medium & ut conditio*, though not *ut fides, vel ut causa operum.* Doth fruit no otherwise perfect the tree, than by *Manifestation?* I am not of your mind in that, I think the tree is perfected, as the *totum integrale* by the accretion of a noble part, and also as a *medium* in attaining a *chief end.*

5. To your third I say, *Procreation* perfecteth Marriage *ut medium perficitur per finem*, though not in the *essence* of Marriage: And so doth *Works perfect Faith*, though *Works* be but the *neareſt end*, and not the *ultimate.* This is the Illustration which you could not see.

6. But my fullest Explication is in the next, where I doubt not is your greatest oversight. Faith is not *God's Covenant*, but the *Condition of it:* But Faith is *our Covenant it self. Faith* and *Covenanting* is the same thing (as Dr. *Preston* oft makes it the Marriage-Covenant:) To *Consent* (after Assent, that is still implied) that Christ as offered in his *Offices*, and to these *uses*, shall be *mine*, and that I will accordingly *be his*, is *justifying Faith*, and is the *Covenant* on our *part* (as to the *heart-Covenant:*) And the profession of this Faith (if fully) is nothing but *open covenanting.* And therefore my similitude doth *quadrare:* And just as the *Marriage-Covenant* is *perfected* by after-*Marriage*, *Faithfulness*,

fulness, Love, Subjection; so is *Faith perfected* by *Works*; that is, not *in esse conjugii, fidei, unionis initæ*; but as the *medium*, that is, the *Condition* of *continuing the interest* which Faith alone hath obtained. But then as to the *Title*, to the *great Absolution* at *Judgment*, and to Salvation, *Works* in our case go beyond Marriage-fidelity in the similitude.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Faith alone is not the entire perfect Condition of the New-Covenant, but Faith with Repentance, and sincere Obedience is.*

Animadvers.

In all points (I grant) Faith alone is not the entire Condition of the New-Covenant; but yet it is for so much as concerns Justification, because Faith alone doth apprehend Christ, by whose Righteousness we are justified. It is true, some Repentance must go before Justification: but no Repentance without Faith, will avail to Justification: And for the Reason pre-alledged, Justification is ascribed, not to Repentance; but to Faith only. As for sincere Obedience, it proceeds from Faith, and so follows Justification, and therefore is not a Condition pre-required for the obtaining of it.

Reply.

1. Your first Assertion and its Reason is already denied; and you attempt not the proof of it.

2. What if Repentance will not avail without Faith? may it not therefore avail with it?

3. Remission of sin is ordinarily ascribed to Repentance as the Condition; and therefore your Reason pre-alledged, is no Scripture-Reason, nor sound.

4. Sincere Obedience goes before that Justification which it is the Condition of, though it follow the beginning of Justification.

Aphor.

Aphoriſm.

Page 302. *SO I acknowledg, that the very firſt point of Juſtification is by Faith alone, without either the Concomitancy, or Co-operation of Works; for they cannot be performed in an inſtant. But the continuance and accompliſhment of Juſtification, is not without the joynt-procurement of Obedience.*

Animadverſ.

1. Here (methinks) you yield the whole Cauſe. For if we be firſt juſtified by Faith alone, then Works do not concur with Faith to procure our Juſtification, ſeeing it is procured already by Faith alone without Works.

2. And as our Juſtification is begun, ſo it is continued. It is begun by the beginning of Faith, and continued by the continuance of Faith: Though true juſtifying Faith can neither continue nor begin without a fitneſs to produce Works, and ſo an actual production of them in due time.

Reply.

If this Conceſſion will make us one, I think I ſhall never recall it. But it is a ſtrange yielding of the Cauſe.

1. Works do not concur to procure that firſt change, which makes us *juſtos ex injuſtis*: Doth it follow that therefore they concur not as Conditions of that *continued Moral* act of God by his *Covenant*, by which he doth truly juſtifie us every day.

2. If that be a good Reaſon, then no *act of Faith* through our lives doth juſtifie us, but the *firſt act*: for every *after-act* findeth us juſtified. But that this is falſe, I prove 1. *Ad hominem*: You confeſs it in the next lines, that our Juſtification is continued by the *Continuance* of Faith; and that *Continuance* is as truly *juſtifying* as the firſt. Which is fully proved. 2. In that the act of Faith, which

the

the Scripture saith was imputed to *Abraham* for Righteousness, was not his first act. Nor that of *Abel*, *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Moses*, &c. mentioned in *Heb.* 11. I take this for plain proof. 3. The sum of all your mistake is your Assertion, that [*As our Justification is begun, so it is continued,*] which meaning of the *Condition* is far from truth. It is *continued* by the same *God*, *Christ*, *Merit*, *Covenant*: But not by the same *condition* only. 4. Your next words contradict this: For the first act of Faith (which you say *begins* it) and the *continuance* (that is, the renewed acts; for the *same act* continueth not) is not all one. But if you mean *specifically*, though not *numerically* the same; that's not so neither. 2. I have proved out of many Scriptures, that [*forgiving others*,] *Repentance* of after-sins, *praying* for Pardon, sincere Obedience, &c. are by God made conditions of Continuance. 3. And (that it may not seem strange) it is usually so in almost all conveyance of Right by Contracts. There is more put in the Contract as the *Condition* of *continuing Right*, than of *first possessing* it. Marriage, Consent or Contract on the Womans part, is all the Condition of her first right to her Husband, and his Honours and Estate: But Fidelity, Love, Subjection (specially of the Church to Christ, who is also absolute Lord) is also part of the Condition of Continuance. Your Servant shall have first right to the priviledges of a Servant in your Family upon the bare Contract; but it shall not be *continued* but on his faithful serving you. A Tenant hath *first Right* and *Possession* on his Lease and Fine; but the *Continuance* is on Condition that he also pay his *Rent*. The Subject hath the priviledges of a Subject,

ject on his *engaging* to the Sovereign Power; but the *Continuance* is on his *fidelity* and actua obedience to the Laws. And the Reason is, because in all these Covenants, there is besides the present *Covenanting* (which is all that's first required) somewhat promised and covenanted to be done for the future, that the benefits may be enjoyed. We covenant to do something which must be done. In what sense soever *James* saith, Abraham *was justified by Works* (supposing it *coram Deo*), I think his Justification was *begun* without them. This therefore I conceive to be the root of most of your mistakes in this point.

Aphorism.

Page 303. *First, say they*, Abraham's *Faith was perfected long before.* Answ. *Not as it is a fulfilling of that Condition which also requireth its acting by obedience.*

Animadvers.

But *Abraham*'s Faith was perfect long before, as it is the fulfilling of that Condition which is required unto Justification: For by it long before he was justified, *Gen.*15. 6.

Reply.

Just as a woman hath fulfilled the *Marriage-Conditions* by her actual *Marriage* (which is fulfilling enough to *give* her an *Interest*, but not to *continue* it:) And as you fulfil the Sovereigns Conditions of enjoying the priviledges of a Subject, by engaging to him as Sovereign: Which is enough for first Possession, but not for Continuance.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Abraham* (say they) *was justified long before* Isaac *was offered, therefore that could be but a manifesting of it.* Answ. *Justification is a continued act: God is still justifying, and the Gospel still justifying.* Abraham's *Justification was not ended before.*

Animadvers.

Though Justification be a *continued act*, yet nevertheless *Abraham* was justified long before he offered *Isaac*, as the series of the History doth clearly shew. *Abraham*'s Justification (I grant) was not ended before, nor yet after: it shall never end. For Christ's Righteousness whereby we are justified, is an everlasting Righteousness. *Dan.* 9.24. and therefore our Justification is an everlasting Justification. But if you mean, that *Abraham*'s Justification was not perfect before he was but half justified, or but in part: If this be your meaing, it agrees neither with Scripture nor Reason that I can see. The Scripture saith, that he was justified, his Faith was imputed unto him for Righteousness: It no where intimateth that his Justification was incomplete, and part of it then, and another part a long time after. He was so justified, that Righteousness was imputed unto him; he was reputed of God just and righteous: And what is more required? Indeed if he had not shewed his Faith by his Works, he had shewed that his Faith was not such whereby he could be justified; and so the Scripture had not been fulfulled, which saith, *Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for Righteousness.* Therefore all that St. *James* requires is, that we shew our Faith by our Works.

Reply.

1. I have fully told you what was wanting. His Justification in Application to *Abraham* as the subject *in præsenti statu* was perfect: But that Justification would not have been perfect to him a year after, when he was to be justified from the guilt of many more sins.

2. And

2. And his Justification was to be *continued*, which could not be done by the *same means* alone that begun it. The relation will cease *cessante fundamento*: And if *Works* had not been added to Faith, the *Fundamentum*, (the *Gospel-Grant* and *Virtual-Sentence*) would have ceased for want of that performance of the Condition.

3. Sentential Justification (which is the most proper, full, noble Justification) is either not at all till Judgment, or certainly not perfect till then. You are not yet freed from all Satan's Accusations till at that Bar and Day.

4. You argue not soundly, [*Christ's Righteousness is everlasting, therefore our Justification is so:*] I believe the truth of the Conclusion, but not that it follows your premises, except you add much more to it.

Aphorism.

Page 308. IN Rom. 3.28. & 4. 2,3, 14,15,16. Gal. 2. 16. & 3. 21, 22. Ephes. 2. 8, 9. Phil. 3. 8, 9. *the Apostle's dispute is upon this Question, What is the Righteousness which we must plead against the Accusation of the Law, or by which we are justified as the proper Righteousness of that Law? And this he well concludeth is neither Works nor Faith, but the Righteousness which is by Faith, that is, Christ's Righteousness.*

Animadvers.

1. If we be fully freed from the accusation of the Law, we are fully justified: For what can accuse or condemn us, if not the Law? therefore if the Righteousness of Christ be that which we must plead against the Accusation of the Law, then the Righteousness of Christ is that whereby we are fully justified. What need then of a twofold Righteousness, as that by which we must

must be justified, as you have said before? Faith indeed is required, that the Righteousness of Christ may be apprehended by us, and imputed to us, that we may be justified by it: But here Faith is no distinct Righteousness by which we are justified, but only the Condition required of us, that the Righteousness of Christ may be ours to Justification. And in this respect only are we said to be justified by Faith, because it apprehendeth Christ's Righteousness whereby we are justified.

Reply.

1. That you may be fully freed from the Condemnation of the Law, and so be fully justified, you must first perform the Condition of the New-Testament, or New-Law, and so be just *quoad præstationem conditionis.*

If any had rather say, that the general Obligation to Obedience is more properly said to be our very *subjection*, and a result of God's Relation to us, than the effect of any Law, and so that it is neither the Old-Covenant nor the New that causeth this general Obligation, and so that Faith in Christ is a duty of the New-Covenant only, because it is there only commanded *in specie*, I think he will speak more properly than either Mr. *C.* or I have here done.

2. This Condition being imposed by a New-Law, backed with its Sanction, is therefore it self a Righteousness in the sense of that Law: For the fulfilling of the Conditions of a Law, is a real Righteousness in the sense of that Law, when the Question is, *de Titulo ad præmium, vel de reatu pœnæ.*

3. As *Bradshaw* well saith, Christ satisfied not for all that we should perform to the Law, but all that we should perform, and did not; (that is, for our sins) except this Condition of the New-Covenant. This Condition therefore (as before is shewed) is part of the Duty of the Old-Law (in the sense before opened) taken out and made a New-Law by conjunction

junction with a New-Sanction (as *Adam*'s Body from the Earth) and so imposed as of indispensible necessity; and the final neglect of it excepted from pardon. And so when-ever you call it [the Condition,] and deny the performance to be a Righteousness in sense of that Law, you contradict your self. Yet as the New-Law is but *Lex Remedians*, and so a *Subordinate Law*; so is *this Righteousness* but a *Subordinate Righteousness*, having the nature of a *medium* to the Righteousness of the *Old Law*: Neither of them alone, but both together, are *Justitia universalis*: But the Righteousness of the Old-Law, had it been performed by our selves, would have been *Justitia universalis*: And *Christ's Righteousness* imputed is nearest to it; for there is excepted out of it, only our own performance of the Condition of the New-Testament. As therefore the *medium* goes before the *end*, so we must have this *personal Righteousness præstitæ conditionis Novi-Testamenti*, before we can have that which freeth us from the Law.

4. To your Question, I say, The Accuser of the Brethren can accuse you besides the Law: And the New-Law will accuse Unbelievers and Rebels against Christ, besides the *Old Law*: (*The Words that I speak shall judg you*, &c.) And you must have a Righteousness *Evangelical* of your *own performance* to plead against Satan's Accusation, that you are an Unbeliever, Hypocrite, Rebel; or else never be sententially justified.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *But now St.* James's *question is; What is the Condition of our Justification by this Righteousness of Christ, Whether Faith only, or Works also?*

Animadvers.

St. *James* (that I see) doth not propound either expresly or implicitely any such Question, but only doth confute those that rely on such a Faith as is without Works. See *James* 2. 14,15,16,17,18. The different state of the Question, as handled by St. *Paul* in his Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, and as handled by St. *James* in *Chap.* 2. is well expressed by *Beza* in *Jac.* 2. 14. *Illic de causa quæstio est: hic vero de effectis: Illic à causa ad effecta descenditur, hic ab effectis ascenditur ad causam. Illic quæritur quomodo Justificemur? hic quomodo justificati fuisse intelligamur: Illic excluduntur opera tanquam Justificationis causæ: hic stabiliuntur tanquam Justificationis causa: hic stabiliuntur tanquam Justificationis effecta. Illic negantur opera præcedere Justificandos: hic dicuntur Justificatos consequi.*

Reply.

His whole Dispute is against those that rely on Faith alone without Works. But *how* did they rely on *Faith?* As their *Legal Righteousness*, instead of *Christ's Satisfaction?* I trow not, nor will you say so. It was therefore as the *Condition* of the *New Covenant* that they relied on it; or else I pray tell me how, and under what notion? And therefore *James*'s scope must needs be, to prove that Faith alone is not the *Condition:* [*Can Faith save him? A man is justified by Works, and not by Faith only*, &c.] I am loth to stand to open the mistakes in *Beza*'s words. To his first difference. 1. *Paulus non loquitur de fide ut de causa Justificationis (non enim est causa) nec ut de causâ operum: (hoc enim nihil*

nihil esset ad rem suam) Jacobus *quærit de fidei effectis, sed not quâ effecta. Ad differentiam secundam idem dicendum est. Ad tertiam,* Jacobus *non quærit tantum quomodo Justificati fuisse intelligamur: Sed quomodo, vel quibus mediis Justificamur quoad confirmationem, continuationem & quoad sententiam, nec non quomodo salvemur. Ad quartam, Ut* Paulus *excludit opera ut Justificationis causa, ita & ego: Stabiliuntur autem à* Jacobo *non tantum ut Justificationis effecta sed etiam ut conditiones & media: Effecti (enim) ut effecti nulla est necessitas moralis ad finem: Sed opera hic stabiliuntur ut necessaria ad Justificationem,* Vers. 22, 23, 24, 26. *& salutem,* Vers. 14. *Ad quintam, Et ego opera Justificationis initium præcedere pernego: Sed* Jacobus *non tantum dicit opera Justificationem consequi, sed ad Justificationem ulteriorem, & salutem esse necessaria.*

Aphorism.

Page 309. PAul *doth either in expreſs words, or in the ſence and ſcope of his ſpeech, only exclude the Works of the Law; that is, the fulfilling the Conditions of the Law our ſelves: But never the fulfilling of the Goſpel-Conditions, that we may have part in Chriſt.*

Animadverſ.

Paul doth abſolutely exclude *Works* from Juſtification, as I proved before. Though ſometimes he mentions the Works of the Law, yet not ſo as if by ſome *other Works* we might and ſhould be juſtified. For indeed, *all Works*, if *good*, are Works of the Law, *i.e.* Works which the Law doth require: And to be juſtified by Works (of what ſort ſoever) as *Works*, is to be juſtified by the *Law*. And therefore to the Righteouſneſs which is of the Law, *Paul* oppoſeth the Righteouſneſs which is of Faith, *Rom.* 10. 5, 6. even as he oppoſeth Working to Believing, *Rom.* 4. 5. So that to be juſtified by the Law, and to be juſtified by Works (any Works, whatſoever they be) is

one and the same thing, and contradistinct to being justified by Faith or Believing. Though therefore believing be working, yet we are not justified by believing, as it is working, so as to rest in that Work, as a Work for Justification: But we are justified by believing, in that thereby we are made partakers of the Righteousness of Christ, which is the only Righteousness whereby we are justified.

2. It is most sure, *Paul* doth not exclude that fulfilling of the Gospel-Conditions, that we may have part in Christ; *viz.* that so in Christ we may have Righteousness, and by that Righteousness may be justified; which by any Righteousness of our own, out of Christ, we cannot be. *Paul* so excludes Works, that he *sets* up Faith; and he so sets up Faith, that he sets up Christ, as him by whose Righteousness, through Faith imputed to us, we are justified. By him all that believe are justified, *Acts* 13. 39. And so much you acknowledg presently after, saying, [Paul *doth by the word* Faith] *especially direct your thoughts to Christ believed in. For to be justified by Christ, and to be justified by receiving Christ, is with him all one.*

Reply.

1. All Works are not the fulfilling the *Old-Laws Condition*, nor performed with such a conceit.

2. To be justified by the *New-Law*, against the Accusation of *Unbelief* or *Rebellion* against Christ that bought us, by our Faith and Obedience, is not to be justified by the Law of Works against the Accusation of being Sinners.

3. You are fain your self to distinguish between *quod opus*, and *quâ opus*, lest Faith be shut out: and I need no more to keep in *obedience* to Christ. For when you should have told us what the [*qua*] is in which Faith is included, you say, [*In that thereby we are made partakers of Christ's*, &c.] But either you mean (by this dark equivocal) *quâ apprehensio*, that is, *qua fides, vel qua conditio naturalis* (which I have at large confuted in another Brother's Notes;) or you mean *quâ conditio* as you must, or none:).

And

And so say I of Obedience: It doth continue our title to Christ as a Condition which Faith begun. 2. The rest I assent to.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *And when he doth mention Faith as the Condition, he alway implieth Obedience to Christ; therefore [Believing] and [obeying the Gospel] are put for the two Summaries of the whole Condition.*

Animadvers.

When he mentioneth Faith as the Condition of our Justification, he doth not imply *Obedience* as that which must concur with Faith to Justification, though he imply it as a fruit of that Faith whereby we are justified. They that have believed, must be careful to maintain good Works, *Tit.* 3.8.

Reply.

He implieth Obedience, not as concurrent with Faith in our first Justification, but in the Continuance and Consummation. He implieth Obedience in requiring Faith as truly, as he that subjecteth himself to a Prince, doth imply future Obedience in his engagement to obey.

Aphorism.

Page 310. *That we are justified by sincere Obedience to Christ, as the secondary part of the Condition of our Justification, is evident also from these following Scriptures*, Matth. 12. 37. & 11. 25,26. Luke 6. 37. Matth. 6. 12,14,15. 1 Joh. 1. 9. Acts 8. 22. & 3. 19. & 22. 16. 1 Pet. 4. 18. Rom. 6. 16. 1 Pet. 12. 22.

Animadverſ.

Some of theſe places prove, that juſtifying Faith muſt ſhew it ſelf by the fruit of ſincere Obedience, as *Mat.* 12. 37. *Mar.* 11. 25,26. *Luke* 6. 37. *Mat.* 6. 12,14,15. *Rom.* 6. 16. Some of them ſhew, that Repentance and turning to God is required as Antecedent to Juſtification, as 1 *John* 1. 19. *Acts* 3. 19. But this turning to God is by Faith; and without Faith all Repentance is vain and unprofitable, as that of *Judas* was. To the ſame purpoſe is that, *Acts* 8. 22. where together with Repentance, is joyned Prayer; but it muſt be the prayer of Faith, *James* 5. 15. So that ſtill it is Faith that doth all in point of Juſtification. That *Acts* 22. 16. *Ariſe and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſins, calling on the name of the Lord,* impotts only (I think) thus much, that by being baptized, *Paul* was to have the waſhing away of his ſins confirmed to him; for he was already a Believer, and ſo his ſins through faith in Chriſt's blood were waſhed away: His Baptiſm therefore was only to confirm this to him, and to aſſure him more fully of it. What 1 *Pet.* 1. 2,22. & 4. 18. are to the matter in hand, I cannot ſee: Perhaps theſe places are miſprinted.

Reply.

1. Your word, [*muſt ſhew it ſelf*, &c.] expreſſeth a neceſſity: What is the neceſſity of the addition of Obedience? Is it only *ex neceſſitate Præcepti*, that is, Obedience is a *Duty?* Then a man may be ſaved without it; which is not true. Is it *neceſſitas medii?* What *kind* of *medium* then is it? It is too much to ſay, *a Cauſe:* I know no other than to ſay *a Condition: Antecedens qua tale non eſt medium.*

2. Let's peruſe ſome of the Texts, *Matth.* 12. 37. *By thy words thou ſhalt be juſtified, and by thy words thou ſhalt be condemned.* What expreſſions would you expect to ſatisfie you, if theſe be not plain enough? Is not this as plain as, [*We are juſtified by Faith?*] Mark 11. 25,26. Mat. 6. 12. 14,15, Luke 6. 37, &c. Are you able to invent words, wherein the nature of a *Condition* is expreſſed more plainly than

than in these, [*For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive your trespasses.*] Prove if you can, that *Faith* is a *Condition*, by plainer words than these! So 1 *John* 1. 9. *If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness?* Acts 3. 19. *Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the time of refreshing shall come*, &c.] Is here nothing but *Antecedency?* Can you plainlier express *necessitatem medii?* So *Acts* 8. 22. [*Repent and pray*, &c.] I never believed that Repentance and Prayer are but *Antecedents* of Forgiveness, and *no means?* nor ever mean to believe it. We have got an honest custom of calling *Prayer* a *means*, which will disadvantage you herein. Hath *Prayer* and *Repentance* no *Conducement* to the obtaining of the end? This would much cool Prayer, if throughly received. And what *means* below a *Condition*, can you imagine these to be, for Remission of sins? yet I call them but the *secondary part* of the *Condition*. And if I had but said, they are *Conditiones conditionis ut à Deo acceptandæ*, I had said as much as this: For as *Causa causæ est causa causati*; so *Conditio acceptandæ conditionis est conditio conditionati*. To that *Acts* 22. 16. I shall say little, having said so much in my Book of Baptism. As the solemnizing of a King's Coronation, or a Mayors or Bailiffs Instalment in his Office, by taking his Oath, is not the Confirmation of that which before was compleated, but the compleating of that which before was incompleat; so is Faith of the *heart* without *solemn Baptismal Covenanting*

(where it may be done) but a *means* of *Justification*, not yet *compleated*. In 1 *Pet.* 1. 22. there is this to the matter in hand, that *Sanctification* of the Spirit is a *means* or *cause* of *Obedience*, and *Obedience* a *means* to the *sprinkling of Christ's blood*, and the Soul is *purified* by *obeying the Truth*; which may include Purification from the *guilt* of sin, as well as the *power*. And 1 *Pet.* 4.18. the Righteousness and diligence of the Righteous, is a *means* to their *Salvation*, as it is opposed to the ungodlie's *not standing in Judgment*. Many more Texts might be brought to this end, besides those in the *Aphoris.* Perhaps I shall add some when we come to speak of the Conditions of Salvation.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *OUr full Justification, and our everlasting Salvation, have the same Conditions on our part: But sincere Obedience is without all doubt the Condition of our Salvation; therefore also of our Justification.*

Animadvers.

Our Justification here is full, though the fulness of it doth not so fully appear as it shall hereafter. For Christ being received into our hearts by Faith, we are fully justified, even acquitted from all sin, and freed from all Condemnation, *Acts* 13. 39. *Rom.* 8. 1. 33.

Reply.

This is a mistake that, methinks, it should not be hard to convince you of. You are at first believing acquitted from all sin that you are then *guilty of*, and all *Condemnation* which the *Law virtually* hath at *that time* against you (*Actualiter enim condemnare judicis est, non Legis:*) But you are not acquit of all or any of the sins of your *whole life afterward.*

2. And

2. And you *hold* that same Justification, but on the performance of a *further Condition* than the first which begun it.

3. And *sentential Justification* is the most proper Justification and full; and that is not full (if at all) till Judgment. I laid great weight on this Thesis (seeing Scripture is so plain, that *Obedience* is a Condition of *Salvation*, that our Divines ordinarily acknowledge it) (as our Assembly fully in the *Catech.*) I expected therefore that you should either deny the *major* or *minor*, but you deny neither, if I understand you, but only take hold of the word [*Full.*] But I will not so leave you, but desire you to tell me: 1. *Whether sentential Justification at Judgment, be properly Justification or not?* 2. If it *be*, (as doubtless it is) then, *Whether that Justification and our Salvation have not the same Conditions?* If you say, No: I expect some Reason of your Negation: And I undertake to prove the contrary from Scripture. 3. Whether *Obedience* joyned to *Faith* and *Perseverance in both*, be not the *proper Condition* of our *Salvation?* It is beyond doubt as much as the truth of Scripture I think.

Aphorism.

Page 311. *IT would be as derogatory to Christ's Righteousness, if we be* saved *by Works, as if we be justified by them.*

Animadverf.

True, if we be saved by the *merit* of Good-works: Yet they are *via Regni*, though not *causa Regnandi*: therefore they must go before Salvation, I mean the full accomplishment of it: But not so *before Justification*. First, we must be justified, and then do good Works, *Tit.* 3. 8. But we must first do good Works, and then be saved, *Rom.* 2. 6,7.

Reply.

Reply.

Your Answer would much confirm me in my judgment, if I doubted: 1. I reasoned from the common Argument that is brought against me, as being invalid (which is, That it is an encroaching on the honour of Christ and his Righteousness, and free Grace, for a man to be justified by sincere Obedience to Christ, as the secondary part of the Condition of continued and sentential Justification) thus: If it be not derogatory to Christ's Righteousness that we be *saved* by such Works, then it is not derogatory to it that we be *justified* by them: But, *&c.* therefore, *&c.* To the *minor* only you answer, [*True if we be saved by the merit of them.*] A true and sound Answer! But why say you not so of *Justification* also, nor yet give a Reason of the difference? If we were *justified* by the *merit* of *Obedience*, then it would be derogatory to Christ's Righteousness; But we are not justified by the merit of it; therefore, *&c.* 2. I would I knew what you mean by *via Regni*. Sure *via* is more than an Antecedent. And if a *means*, you should tell us, what it is less than a *Condition*. 3. Must not Obedience go as much before Justification at Judgment, as before Salvation? Or must you indeed be first justified at Judgment before you obey? If you should insist on it, that Justification at Judgment *per sententiam judicis* is no proper *Justification*, but a *Declaration* of it, you will have all the World of Lawyers and Divines against you, and I need not say more. Indeed it is not such a *constitutive Justification* as that *per Legem*, but it is *more*, a proper and full Justification of another kind, to which this is but a means.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *That which a man is justified by, he is saved by.*

Animadverf.

He is thereby put into a state of Salvation. *For whom he justified, them he also glorified,* Rom. 8. 30. Yet are we not fully possessed of Salvation, not glorified without good Works, as we are fully justified without them. They follow Justification as fruits of that Faith whereby we are justified: But they go before Glorification, as making way for the enjoyment of it.

Reply.

1. They go as much before Justification by *Sentence*, and as *continued*, as before *Glorification*.

2. Our debate is about *conveyance of Right*. In justifying, it is the same thing to *give Right* to it, and to give the *thing it self*. In *Glorification*, and all *real Mutations* it is not so. You yield the thing that I assert.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Yet here I say still,* [our full Justification,] *because as I have shewed, our first possession of it is upon our mere Faith and Contract with Christ.*

Animadverf.

Our first possession of Justification is so full, as that there is no Condemnation belonging to us: And what can be more full, but only a more full manifestation of it.

Reply.

I have troubled you too oft already with repeating the same things. Though there be now no Condemnation to you, yet to morrow there will be, if you should not sincerely obey: For you would cease to be in Christ.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. & 312. *I Think our Glorification will be acknowledged to have the same Conditions with our first Justification at the Bar of Christ, and why not to our continued Justification on earth?*

Animadvers.

Our Justification in the last Judgment is not properly a *compleating* of our Justification, as it were only *begun* here, and left imperfect till hereafter: But it is only a publick manifestation of it: Thus your self expresses it, *Append.* p. 158. [*Indeed there is a Justification by publick Declaration at the great Judgment*, &c.] But Glorification being the compleatment of Salvation, whatever is requisite as Antecedaneous to compleat Salvation, is required as a Condition of our Glorification.

Reply.

Ad eadem sunt eadem dicenda. Justification at Judgment is not a mere *constituting* us *Righteous*, but a *declaring* us *Righteous*. But it is a *declaring* of a *Righteousness* in *Question*, and that by a *Supreme Judg* against a *publick Accuser*, which is requisite *ad plenam possessionem Præmii per Legem justis debiti*: And so it is not *only Declarare, sed statuere & jus Vindicare*: And is more properly called justifying, than [*making just*] is: (You here confess a Condition of Glorification.)

Aphorism.

Page 312. *AND hath that no hand in their Justification that giveth them* right *to the tree of Life*, &c.

Animadvers.

They that keep God's Commandments, are said [*to have right to the Tree of Life*,] Rev. 22. 14. because such have true Faith in Christ: And that it is indeed that giveth them that right. *You are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus*

ſus, Gal. 3. 26. *And if Children, then heirs, heirs of God, joynt-heirs with Chriſt*, Rom. 8. 17. We may alſo diſtinguiſh between *jus ad rem*, and *Jus in re*. Faith in Chriſt alone gives the former right to the Tree of Life: But Works help to the attainment of the latter.

Reply.

1. The Text ſaith, [*That they may have right, and may enter in*, &c.] Doth Obedience *get Faith*? (ſurely no: not as it is here meant.) Doth it *only manifeſt it*? How then doth Obedience *procure right*? Will you again ſay here, that by [*keeping the Commandments*,] is not meant [*keeping the Commandments*,] but [*a working Faith.*] It is not only *James*, but multitudes of other plain Texts that muſt be forced, if your Opinion muſt ſtand. If this Text do not plainly make Obedience to be a *means* of our *right* to the Tree of Life, I know not how to underſtand ſenſe by words.

2. *Faith* may give them *right*, and ſo may *Obedience* too. You argued thus even now [*Repentance will not ſerve without Faith; therefore Faith doth all:*] nego ſequelam.

3. If you mean properly by [*Jus in re*] *right* to *mediate Poſſeſſion*, and not the *Poſſeſſion it ſelf* (which is no *right*) you grant as much as I need.

4. But the Text doth moſt plainly aſcribe both ſorts of *right* to Obedience. Ad rem [*right to the Tree of Life:*] Jure, [*may enter in by the gate.*]

5. Do you indeed believe, that a man can have *jus ad gloriam* by *Faith*, without Obedience, if he live to age.

6. Or will you debaſe Faith ſo much as to ſay, that it is ſufficient to give only *jus ad rem*, and not *jus in re*: Indeed it is the ſame right that comes by both: Even *jus ad rem & in re*.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 313. *BEsides all those Texts under* Thes. 22. *which prove a personal Righteousness, so called from the Conformity to the Gospel.*

Animadvers.

A personal Gospel-Righteousness is acknowledged to be requisite, but not as that whereby we are justified.

Reply.

Enough of this already.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *SEE* Rom. 8. 4, 13.

Animadvers.

In *Rom.* 8. 4. the Righteousness of the Law is said to be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. But I see not what this makes for you, who speak of an Evangelical Righteousness, which is contradistinct to Legal Righteousness. And for the words themselves, if they speak of a perfect and exact fulfilling of the Righteousness of the Law, then it is by *Imputation*. And so *Calvin* expounds it, *Hoc ad veniam referre necesse est*, &c. And so one more ancient than *Calvin* or *Luther* expounds that in the *Canticles*; *Thou art all fair my Love, and there is no spot in thee*: Sine macula deputatur, quia culpa non imputatur. Otherwise it must be understood of an *inchoate* and imperfect fulfilling, which is not sufficient unto Justification. See *Psal.* 18. 21, 22, 23. & 119. 6. B. *Davenant* in answer to *Bellarmine* objecting this place, makes use of both Expositions. *De Just. act. c.* 52. *p.* 562. That in *Rom.* 8. 13. *For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall dye. But if ye through the Spirit, mortifie the deeds of the flesh, ye shall live:* That, I say proves, that a continued course in sin is damnable; and that Holiness and Obedience is necessary unto Salvation: Which by the beginning of the Paragraph may seem to be all that you aimed at, and it were pity any should deny you this: But it proves not (as ye in words immediately foregoing, and so also those before-cited, you seem to intend) that a personal Righteousness is necessary unto Salvation.

Reply

Reply.

1. An *inchoate and imperfect* Righteousness (as you call it; and truly *quoad materiam remotam*) is sufficient to justifie us against the Accusation of *Not fulfilling* of the *Gospel-Conditions*.

2. Instead of discussing the sense of this Text, I will refer you to *Ludov. de Dieu in loc.* where also you shall find the same Doctrine that I deliver. *Rom.* 8. 13. proves fully, not only that Obedience is necessary to Salvation, *necessitate præcepti*, but that it is a proper *Condition* of it, and necessary *necessitate medii*. I would you would have told me how it is necessary?

And here by the way, let me mind you of one thing, which I have not fully done yet: You make a great difference between the Condition of *Justification*, and the Condition of *Salvation*. Indeed both have the *same Condition*, if you speak of *right to Salvation*, and of *justifying* that *Right* against all Accusers. (And as *Reatus pœnæ* is the most full proper *Guilt*, so this contrary Justification is the most full proper Justification.) When a man is *accused* to be *Reus mortis*, the Child of Death; he that proves him to be *non-reum*, doth thereby justifie him against that Accusation. Now that is proved, by proving him to have performed the *Condition* of Life, or not done that which *Death* is denounced against. This Text in hand saith, [*If ye live after the flesh ye shall die: But if ye by the Spirit do mortifie the deeds of the body, ye shall live.*] Here is a great part of the New-Law. Now if a man be accused as guilty of this *Death*, he that proveth that he lived not after the flesh, but mortified it, doth most properly *justifie* him. And yet here is

no

no talk of Justification or pardon of sin in the Text: What of that? The same Covenant promiseth or giveth *Justification* and *right* to Salvation on the *same Conditions*; but more frequently mentioneth *Salvation*, as containing all other benefits: But certainly he that against an Accuser proves a man's interest in a *promise of Salvation*, doth *eo nomine* justifie that man, though that Promise mention not *Justification*. Our first *accepting Christ* for Lord and Saviour (supposing *our taking God* for our *only God*, and *chief Good*) doth give us an *immediate right* to *Justification* and *Salvation*; and if then we died, we should be saved. But our obeying Christ, and confiding in him as a Lord and Saviour (according to our Covenant) doth *continue* (as a Condition) our right to *both* Justification and Salvation. It seems to me an ungrounded fancy (such as Divines have spun many of, to perplex poor Souls and themselves, going the Schoolmens way of adding their devised conceits, even while they blame them) to make *one thing* (the single act of *Faith only*) to be the *Condition* of *Justification*, and *Obedience* to be the *Condition* of *Glorification*. And yet (to deal freely with you) I meet with none more guilty of this than you. For you discern, that the ordinary Doctrine of Faith's justifying as an *Instrument*, is not exact or proper, and therefore you affirm it to be the *sole Condition* of *Justification*. Whereas other Divines tell me, that *Faith* and *Obedience* are both *Conditions* of *Justification* (and in that are like) but *Faith* only is the *Instrument* of *Justification*: (And in that they differ.)

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *HE that maketh Faith and Obedience to Christ to be only the fulfilling of the Condition of the New-Covenant, and so to be only Conditions of Justification, doth give them no part of the work of his Righteousness, seeing he came not to fulfil the Gospel, but the Law.*

Animadvers.

1. The fulfilling of the Law is that whereby we are justified, as by the transgression of the Law we are condemned. Now Christ hath fulfilled the Law for us, having made satisfaction for our breach of it, *Gal.* 3. 10,13. therefore by Christ's Satisfaction we are justified. This the Gospel doth hold unto us, requiring of us Faith to receive Christ, and to apply his Satisfaction, that we may take the benefit of it, and be justified by it, *Acts* 13. 38,39.

But, 2. The Gospel doth not joyn Obedience with Faith, as the Condition of our Justification, though it require Obedience as that which doth follow upon justifying Faith, and flow from it. *Tit.* 3. 8.

Reply.

1. The fulfilling of the Conditions of the New-Law, is that whereby we are justified against the Accusation, 1. Of *non*-fulfilling it: 2. And so of having no part in Christ, nor pardon by him; 3. But being guilty of the far sorer punishment: Even as for the *non*-fulfilling of this Condition, all the World (that hear the Gospel) are condemned. Now Christ hath not fulfilled *this Condition* for us; and therefore we are not in this justified by his Satisfaction.

2. The Gospel doth joyn Obedience with Faith as the Condition of Salvation; therefore also of justifying our *right* to that Salvation, which is the justifying of *us*.

3. You seem to yield the *Thesis* it self, that it is not any incroaching upon the honour of Christ, to make Faith in him, and Obedience to him, to be only the fulfilling of the Conditions of the New-Covenant. And I know no other fault that can be charged on this Doctrine.

Aphorism.

Pag. 315. *But clearly* Luke, *who speaketh of two Cups (which the other do not) doth apply and subjoyn these words,* [I will drink no more of the fruit of, &c.] *to the Cup which was before the Sacramental.*

Animadvers.

By this Reason *Bellarmine* would prove that we have no more certainty from the Scripture, that Wine was in the sacramental Cup, than that Water was in it. But *Jansenius* doth well refute those that apply those words, *Matth.* 26. 29. & *Mark* 14. 25. to the first Cup which *Luke* mentioneth: *At istud non patitur ordo horum Evangelistarum* (saith he) *cum enim nullius alterius Calicis fecerit mentionem præterquam sacri, quando dicitur, ex hoc gemmine, nullus alius calix intelligi potest ab iis demonstratus, quando hujus meminerunt. Jansen. Conc. cap.* 131. *sub finem.* And therefore whereas *Luke* brings in those words, before he speaks of the Institution of the Sacrament, *Austin* (and after him *Jansenius*) doth well expound it by an Anticipation, the words being brought in not in their due order, which *Matthew* and *Mark* observed. Suppose *Luke* had never written his Gospel; How could any have once imagined that the words, [*I will drink no more*, &c.] as related by *Matthew* and *Mark*, could be referred to any other Cup than that of the Sacrament, no other Cup besides being mentioned by them. But though *Matthew* and *Mark* had not written, the words as they are in *Luke*, might be taken as related by Anticipation; it being no unusual thing in Scripture, to relate things or words out of that order in which they were done or spoken.

Reply.

Reply.

1. As to my purpoſe, it is of no great moment in which ſenſe we take: For if Chriſt did receive the Sacrament of his Supper, it is certain it was but that his example, joyned to his words, might be the *Inſtitution*, and not to *the ends* that we take it; no more than he was *baptized* for *incorporation into himſelf*, *burying with himſelf*, *remiſſion of ſins*, &c. which are our ends.

2. I ſay, as *Calvin*, *Facile ſolvitur hic nodus, quia ad rem parum intereſt quo temporis momento hoc Chriſtus dixerit. Nam huc tantum ſpectant Evangeliſtæ, admonitos fuiſſe diſcipulos tam de propinqua Magiſtri ſui morte, quam de nova & cœleſti vitâ*, &c. Yea, why not as *Paræus*, *Nihil vero impedit, quin bis idem repetiverit de utroq; poculo: quia neutrum cum illis amplius erat bibiturus.* Or, as *Piſcator: Sed nihil eſt abſurdi, ſi ſtatuamus eadem verba bis dicta eſſe, ſemel quidem de poculo paſchali, deinde iterum de poculo cœnæ novæ: vel certè verba illa alieno loco vel à* Luca *vel à* Matthæo *eſſe narrata.* Indeed I wholly comply with *Piſcator*'s modeſty, in judging it *uncertain*, though men may caſt in this or that conjecture. But yet I take it to be *moſt probable*, that the words belong only to the *Paſcal Cup*, as *Grotius* and many more think: And that there is no Anticipation in *Luke*, becauſe *Luke* reporting the whole more fully than the reſt, and adding that of the Paſchal-Cup, which the other omitted, it is more likely he ſhould be moſt exact in this: (Though I know not only *Auſtin*, but more of the Ancients, thought Chriſt received the Sacrament, as *Pelargus in loc.* ſhews of ſome.)

3. Your Suppoſition, (if *Luke* had never writ-

ten) might alter the matter were it true: And if *Matthew* and *Mark* had never written, if you would have taken the liberty to diſlocate that of *Luke* under the pretence of a never-proved Anticipation, you would have been bolder than I durſt be.

Aphoriſm.

Pag. 317. *TO conclude, it is moſt clear in Scripture, and beyond all diſpute, that our actual, moſt proper compleat Juſtification at the great Judgment, will be according to our Works*, &c.

Animadverſ.

1. This you oft repeat, and ſo muſt I this: That our Juſtification at the great Judgment, is but the full manifeſtation of that Juſtification which we have now through Faith.

2. Works ſhall then be enquired of but as fruits of Faith, by which Faith, and not by Works, we are now juſtified, and ſhall then fully appear to be juſtified.

Reply.

1. It is *ſuch a Manifeſtation* of our *Righteouſneſs* by the *Judg*, as is the *propereſt Juſtification*, *Apello totum mundum juriſconſultorum & Theologorum Reformatorum*. We maintain that the word is to be taken *in ſenſu forenſi* againſt the Papiſts.

2. To be [*a fruit of Faith*] ſo conſidered, is not to be *medium ad ullum finem*. But ſure Obedience is *medium ad finem*, and ſo *enquired* after. Either there is ſome *end* and *reaſon* why the *fruits* of *Faith* are enquired after, or elſe it is an unreaſonable action (which who dare imagine?) Will you ſay with the Antinomians, that the *end* is only to *manifeſt Faith ut ſigna?* 1. You granted more before, that they are *via ad regnum*: And what Divine doth not grant, that *Obedience* is the *Condition* of *Salvation?* Why then ſhould you not yield, that as *Conditions*, they are enquired after? 2. *Luke*'s phraſe [*Becauſe*

cause thou hast been faithful in a very little, &c.] must signifie at least a *Conditionality*, which is *causa sine qua non*; and not a mere *sign*. 3. The whole Context shews, that *Obedience* is enquired after, as the *Ratio Sententiæ*, and not only as *signs* of something else, which is the *sole Reason*. 4. The uses pretended for this enquiring after mere *signs*, are frivolous. The business of Judgment is to enquire of the *cause*, and to *sentence* the *person* accordingly; and the connexion of the Sentence to this Obedience, by the terms [*Therefore*] and [*Because*,] shews unquestionably, that it is *ipsa causa* that is here spoken of, and not *signa de Causa*. I take [*Cause*] in Law-sense now, and speak not *de Causa Logica*.

Aphorism.

Page 319. SEE Matth. 25. 21, 23, &c. *And most plain is that from the mouth of the Judg himself*, &c. *Matth.* 25. 34, 35.

Animadverf.

What was said immediately before, doth answer what is here objected.

Reply.

And the former Reply satisfies me to that Answer. I only add my desire, that besides all the other Texts you would try, whether these following speak only of *Signs*, and not *Conditions*, Rom. 2. 5, 6, 10. Acts 10. 35. 1 Tim. 4. 16. Rev. 14. 13. 1 John 3. 7. Matth. 7. 24. & 21. 22, 23. John 16. 27. [*The Father hath loved you, because ye have loved me*, &c.] 2 Cor. 5. 10. [*according to that he hath done*,] plainly signifieth *causam & non evidentiam*, Phil. 4. 17. Luke 11. 28. 1 Tim. 6. 18, 19. 1 Cor.

9. 24,25,26,27. Matth. 11. 12. Luke 13. 24. Phil. 2. 12. John 14. 21. James 1. 12. & 2. 5. 1 Cor. 2. 9. & 16. 22. Prov. 8. 17,21. Matth. 10. 37, 38. Hebr. 11. 26. & 10. 35. 2 Thess. 1. 6. Matth. 5. 12, 46. & 6. 1,2. & 5. 16. & 10. 41,42. Luke 6. 35. 1 Cor. 3. 8, 14. 1 Cor. 9. 17. Col. 2. 18. & 3. 23,24. Matth. 6. 4, 6, 18. & 16. 27. Prov. 28. 13. Hebr. 5. 9. Isa. 1. 16,17,18,19. Hebr. 12. 14. Psal. 91. 9, 14. 2 Chron. 34. 27. 1 John 3. 22, 23. *Whatsoever we ask, we receive* (and so Remission) *because we keep his Commandments*, &c. Gen. 22. 16, *&c.*

Aphorism.

Page 320. *THat this is not to discover the sincerity of their Faith, is as evident*, &c.

Animadvers.

This is not so evident, but that there is need of more proof than yet I see brought for it.

Reply.

1. I pray you well weigh the forecited Texts, whether or no one of them prove, that Obedience doth more to our Salvation, than signifie the truth of our Faith.

2. I come newly from writing very many Arguments to prove this to another Brother, which I am loth to repeat.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *THe very phrases of the Text import as much*, Matth. 25. 21, 23. Well done good and faithful Servant, *&c.* Matth. 25. 34,35. For I was hungry, *&c. and in the rest*, According to their Works.

Anim.

Animadverſ.

1. We muſt not ſo much follow the ſound of words, as weigh the ſenſe of them.

2. We muſt not take one place of Scripture barely by it ſelf, but compare one place with another.

3. The Papiſts (you know) make uſe of theſe and the like Scriptures, to prove the *Merit* of Good works. You will ſay, They make nothing for Merit.

4. Neither truly do they (for ought I ſee) for Juſtification by our own perſonal Righteouſneſs; or to prove that Works concur with Faith to Juſtification, as being part of that Condition which the Goſpel doth require of us.

5. That we may be juſtified.

6. The Scriptures alledged only ſhew, how they muſt be qualified, who ſhall be admitted to the actual enjoyment of the heavenly Inheritance. *Well done good and faithful Servant*, &c. *enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.*.

7. It is not ſaid, By this thou art juſtified.

8. And for the particle [*For*,] you are not ignorant I ſuppoſe what *Ameſ.* doth anſwer *Bellarmine*: *Enim rationalem habet conſequentiam, ſed non cauſalem conſequentis reſpectu.* Ameſ. in Bell. l. 7. c. 2. *ad* 3. For thoſe Scriptures that ſpeak of rendring to men according to their Works, they make nothing for Juſtification by Works, no more than they make for the *Merit* of them.

9. Indeed they may ſeem to make more for the latter than for the former; becauſe we muſt firſt be *juſtified*, before we can do Good-works; but we muſt firſt do Good-works before we can enjoy Heaven.

Reply.

1. I will weigh the ſenſe, as ſignified by the *words*, but not *forge* a ſenſe which the words import not.

2. It is many hundred Texts that perſwade me, and not one only.

3. Is the word [*Merit*] in any one Text?

4. For that I will not take my Faith on the beſt mans judgment, ſeeing what wonders Prejudice can do.

5. You know the Queſtion that now directly I was on, was only about *Works procurement* of Salvation, and Juſtification at Judgment thereupon.

6. Do they indeed only ſhew, [*How they muſt be qualified,*] and not [*why,*] or the tendency of thoſe Qualifications to the *end*? Review thoſe cited.

7. A man would think that you would be ſatisfied, if the Scripture did but ſay, [*By this thou art juſtified:*] And yet *James* doth ſay, [*We are juſtified by Works, and not by Faith only*;] and yet you are never the more ſatisfied. *In ſenſu forenſi*, [*according to Works*] is equivalent to [*by Works.*]

8. If *Ameſ.* by [*cauſalem conſequentiæ,*] mean a proper *cauſe*, I ſay ſo too: But to interpret it of a mere *Conſequentia* * *Logica*, makes it next *non*-ſenſe. For Chriſt doth not ſpeak this by way of *Argumentation*; but by way of *Sentence*. And all *Judgment* is paſt upon the *juſtice* or *injuſtice* of the *Cauſe*, as the *Ratio ſententiæ*. There was never Judg expreſſed *Rationem ſententiæ* in plainer terms than Chriſt there doth. At leaſt, methinks, the phraſe in *Luke* 19. 17. ſhould force you to confeſs this: *Becauſe thou haſt been faithful in a very little, have thou authority*, &c. If no plainneſs of ſpeech will ſerve, it is in vain to cite Scripture. See alſo *Verſ.* 27.

But what is the *Ratio conſequentiæ.*

9. Your ſeeming Argument for *Merit*, I have already overthrown, by ſubverting the grounds of it, here again recited.

Aphor.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. *CAn any more be ſaid of Faith, than that we are juſtified and judged to life, both* [*for*] *it, and according to it?*

Animadverſ.

1. I do not know how ſo much may be ſaid of Faith, as that we are juſtified [for] it, though ſo much may be ſaid; (for ſo much the Scripture ſaith) that we are juſtified by it.

2. [For] notes the formal or the meritorious Cauſe. [By] notes only the Inſtrument or the Condition.

3. The Scripturedoth not ſhew that we are juſtificd [by] Works, much leſs [for] them.

4. Though it ſhew that we muſt be judged, and receive our reward according to them.

5. It ſeems ſtrange that you ſhould ſo confound *ſecundum* and *propter*, when-as *Gregory* ſo long ago ſo clearly diſtinguiſhed them: *Aliud eſt ſecundum opera reddere, & aliud propter ipſa opera reddere.* Greg. in 7. pœn. Pſal. five in Pſal. 143. 8.

Reply.

1. I do not mean or ſay, that we are juſtified *Conſtitutivè* [for] Faith, as a Cauſe: nor that Faith is *Cauſa Regnandi*: But that God giveth this (our Faith and Obedience) as the *reaſon* of his abſolving or juſtifying Sentence. And I offer you no other proof than the very expreſs words of Scripture: [*For I was hungry*;] and, [*Becauſe thou haſt been faithful.*] And in *Abraham*'s caſe in the very example that *James* brings to prove Juſtification by Works, it is ſaid, [*Becauſe thou haſt done this, and haſt not ſpared*, &c.] The reaſon why this is *Ratio judicii*, is becauſe, *Lex eſt norma judicis: & quicquid Lex Conditionem præmii conſtituit, hoc ipſum eſt Ratio præmii adjudicandi.* The ſame thing may be *Cauſa ſententiæ*, which is but *Conditio præmii adju-*

adjudicati. Justitia causæ est ratio Justificationis per sententiam judicis: Ideo enim hominem Justificat quia justus est: hoc est, quia causa ejus controversa justa est. Sed tamen hæc causa consistere potest in nudæ Conditionis præstatione, quæ rei adjudicatæ causa propriè dicta, non est.

But indeed it is not [for] but [by] which we express a constitutive causation, whether formal or material.

2. [For] notes other causes than the formal or meritorious. In our case it noteth, *Rationem sententiæ, quæ est quasi causa impulsiva: Ut omnis justitia causæ est causa impulsiva judici ut reum absolvat.*

3. I marvel you say that the Scripture sheweth not that we are justified *by Works*; when you read Christ saying [*By thy words shalt thou be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned*; and *James* 2. 24. *A man is justified by Works*, &c.]

4. [According to them,] is all one *in sensu forensi*, as [*by*] them.

5. I suppose by [*propter*] *Gregory* meant a *meritorious propter*, and so I agree with him. I never mentioned *propter*: The [*For*] that I speak of is [*enim*,] and not [*propter*.] It is *Matthews* [γὰρ,] and *Luke*'s [ὅτι] 19. 17.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *Works are not then considered as a mere sign, whereby God doth discern mens Faith: For he seeth it immediately, and needs no sign.*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

1. By this Reaſon you may as well *null* all the judicial proceedings deſcribed.

2. Yet I grant that Works are then conſidered as a part of the Condition: But not the Condition requiſite to Juſtification, though of the Condition requiſite to Glorification, and complete Salvation.

Reply.

1. If you had proved that all the judicial proceeding is upon *mere ſigns*, and the *ipſa cauſæ juſtitia* is not *meddled* with, then you might have better expected I ſhould receive your affirmation.

2. But why do you then *null* them all your ſelf, by yielding in the very next words, that Works are part of the Condition of Glorification, and ſo not mere ſigns.

3. Is it not an eaſie truth, that in that they are the *Conditions of Glorification*, they muſt needs be the *reaſon of juſtifying* that man who is accuſed to be *Reus pœnæ*, and to have *no right to Glorification*.

Aphoriſm.

Page 322. *IT ſeemeth that Chriſt doth call them Righteous, in reference to this perſonal Evangelical Righteouſneſs mentioned in their juſtifying Sentence*, verſ. 46. [the Righteous into Life Eternal.

Animadverſ.

1. I do not ſee why thoſe words ſhould be called the *juſtifying Sentence*: They rather ſhew how the Sentence before pronounced ſhould be executed.

2. Be it ſo that they are called Righteous, in reference to a perſonal Evangelical Righteouſneſs; yet it doth not follow that this perſonal Evangelical Righteouſneſs is ſuch, as that they are juſtified by it.

Reply.

Reply.

1. You strangely misunderstand my words, contrary to the plain sence of them, which is this, [*Christ in* Vers. 46. *doth call them Righteous, in reference to this personal Evangelical Righteousness mentioned in their justifying Sentence in the former Verses*, viz. [*I was hungry, and ye*, &c.] It is not *Vers.* 46. which I call the Sentence.

2. The whole scope of the Text shews, that they are justified by Love and Obedience, *ut per conditionem præstitam probatam:* The reading all that Chapter satisfies me so fully in that, that all the Arguments in the World, I think, will never make me question it.

Aphorism.

Page 324. *DOth not the contrary Doctrine needlesly constrain men to wrest most plain and frequent expressions of Scripture?*

Animadvers.

I see no expressions of Scripture that we are forced to wrest, by denying Works to justifie as well as Faith: But on the other side, to assert this is (so far as I can see) very repugnant to the Scripture.

Reply.

1. Your expressions may somewhat advantage your cause, in that the sound of the words, [*Justification by Works*] is harsh to them that hear not the words explained. I do no not use that phrase; but rather say thus, that [*our Justification is continued and consummate by Sentence at Judgment, not only by Faith, but by Love, Hope, Repentance, sincere Obedience to the Redeemer, and God in him, as secondary parts of the Conditions of the New-Covenant.*] *James* and *Paul* took not *Works* in the same sense. *Paul* meant

meant by *Works*, *opera meritoria operarii*, or done with a *conceit* of *Merit*; such as *make the reward to be not of Grace, but of Debt*: *James* meant none such, but onely *Obedience* to *God-Redeemer*. If you demand my proof (as some have done) I give it you: The Works that *James* speaks of are necessary to Justification, or (*ipso fatente*) to *Salvation*: But the *Works* that *Paul* speaks of, no Christian must dare to think of performing; viz. *Such as make the reward to be of Debt, and not of Grace*. Now to deny Justification by *Obedience*, in the sense explained, forceth men to wrest multitudes of plain Scripture-Texts: Review them and judg.

Aphorism.

Ibid. DOth *it not uphold that dangerous Pillar of Antinomian Doctrine, that we must not work or perform duty* for *Life and Salvation, but only* from Life *and* Salvation?

Animadverſ.

It is one thing to work for *Life* and *Salvation*, that is, the bliss and happiness of the Life to come; another thing to work for *Justification*, or that we may be justified: The Scriptures teach us as well to deny this, as to assert the other.

Reply.

Speaking of Meritorious or Legal working, I yield that Scripture is against the conceit of it: But of working in our sense, I reply, 1. Shew me *ubi Lex ita distinguit*? 2. Did not I before attempt to prove, that Salvation and Justification at Judgment have the same Conditions? and I did not discern that you plainly denied it, else I should there have further proved it. 3. Devise if you can, any way to justifie a man that is accused to be *Reus pœnæ*, and

and his *title to the Reward denied*, but by justifying his title, and proving that he hath fulfilled the Condition, or is pardoned for *non*-fulfilling. For not-fulfilling the *Conditions* of the *first Law*, we must plead *Pardon* or *Satisfaction* made: But for not fulfilling the *Conditions* of the second *Covenant* there is *no pardon*: It is therefore the fulfilling them it self that must so justifie.

Aphorism.

Page 325. *NOw if Good-works, or sincere Obedience to Christ our Lord, be no part of the Condition of our full Justification and Salvation, who will use them to that end?*

Animadverf.

There is not the like Reason of Justification and Salvation: For Salvation is wrought by degrees; it's begun here, and perfected hereafter. We are saved by Hope, *Rom.* 8. 24. *And we must work out our own Salvation with fear and trembling*, Phil. 2. 12. It is not so in respect of Justification. It hath no degrees in it self, though it hath in the Manifestation of it. For it is a freedom from all sin, in respect of Imputation, and from all Condemnation for sin, *Acts* 13. 39. *Rom.* 8. 1. Salvation is so perfected hereafter, as that some part of it is added, and that the chief part which before was wanting: But Justification is only so perfected, as that the perfection of it is made manifest, and Satan with all other Accusers is for ever put to silence.

Reply.

1. As one good act may *cause another in our selves*, so there is not the *same Reason* between Justification, and that part of Salvation. For that is but the *Condition* of one, which is the *Cause* of the other. But as *Salvation* is the *gift of God*, so there is the *same Reason* of obtaining *right to Justification* and to *Salvation*. They are two distinct *Dues*, flowing

flowing from the *same Covenant*, upon our *union to Christ*, upon the *same Condition* on our part. And the immediate right of possession at Judgment is the same on the same Conditions.

2. I have said enough to this. [*Freedom*] is here ambiguous: Either you mean active Liberation, or passive: If the latter, either you mean a certainty, that we shall not be condemned; or you mean, *non-Condemnation* at present; or you mean *right to Absolution per judicem*; or else *Absolution passive it self*. The Reprobate here are *non-condemnati per sententiam judicis*, though *per Legem* they are *condemned already*. The *Elect* from the foundations of the World were sure (*certitudine objecti*) to be *absolved*; yet were not then freed perfectly. *Right to Absolution* is perfect *pro præsenti in se*, as is the *right* of a Tenant in his house, when he hath taken his Lease; But it is not perfect *pro tempore futuro*: Because, 1. More Conditions are to be performed. 2. More sins to be pardoned. If you mean it of *actual judicial Absolution*, you are not so perfectly freed in this Life.

1. Where there is not the *active Absolution*, there is not the passive: But the *active Absolution judicial per sententiam*, either is not at all in this life, or is not perfect, therefore, &c. *Apologetical* Justification hath degrees: And *Sentential* is the most perfect kind.

2. Justification is opposite to Condemnation: But *Condemnation* is not perfect (if properly any at all) till the Judgment; therefore Justification is not perfect till then. *Condemnatio Legis est tantum virtualis, ut respicit judicium.*

3. Your

3. Your Doctrine is plain Antinomian, if by [*freedom from all sin,*] you mean all *future sin*, as you seem to do. Sin is not pardoned, which is no sin, that is, which is not *yet committed*: *Reatus qui nondum contrahitur, non dissolvitur.*

4. You suppose Justification *per sententiam judicis*, to be no Justification, but a Manifestation of it: When our Divines still say, the word is to be used *in sensu judiciario*. And I have far much more ado with Mr. *L.* (an excellent Politician) to prove, that *constitutive Justification* is so to be *called*. He thinks only *sentential Justification* is true Justification; you think it's *none*: But I think both *Constitutive* and *Sentential*, are truly and properly Justification. *Sententia judicis, vel Condemnationem, vel Absolutionem continet:* (*Et non tantum Condemnationis, vel Absolutionis Manifestationem.*) Zouch. Jurisprud. par. 5. sect. 10, &c. You'll spoil all your Law, if you confound *Jus & Judicium*. A Woman may as fully *manifest* a Felony or Murther, and the dueness of punishment, as the *Judg*; and yet the man shall not for that be executed. The Civil Law saith, that *Judicis decretum requiritur etiam in manifeste prodigo*. Mynsing. in Institut. l. 1. tit. 23. pag. 115.

Aphorism.

Ibid. WHether *this Doctrine doth not tend to drive Obedience out of the World*: For *if men once believe, that it is not so much as a part of the Condition of their Justification, will it not much tend to relax their diligence?*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

No: If they conſider as they ought to do, that though Obedience do not concur with Faith as a Joynt-condition of our Juſtification, yet it is a neceſſary fruit of that Faith whereby we are juſtified.

Reply.

Obſcure ſtill. Do you mean [*Neceſſary*] *neceſſitate Præcepti* only, or *neceſſitate Medii* alſo? If the former, we may be ſaved without it; or elſe *every ſinner* muſt periſh. If the latter, *what means* can it be lower than a *Condition?* If you ſhould mean it, *non de neceſſitate morali ſed naturali*, that requires not our care or diligence.

Aphoriſm.

Page 326. *DOth it not much confirm the World in their Soul-cozening Faith?*

Animadverſ.

It is not the Doctrine that doth it, but the abuſe of the Doctrine; ſome being apt *to turn the Grace of God into laſciouſneſs*, Jude, *v.* 4. How do they confirm the World in their Soul-cozening Faith, who teach, That we are juſtified by receiving Chriſt for our Saviour: But yet teach withal, that none can have him for their Saviour, except they take him for their Lord alſo? The beſt Doctrine may be abuſed: The abuſe is to be prevented or reformed; but the Doctrine it ſelf is not to be deſerted. See *Rom.* 5.20. with 6. 1,14,15.

Reply.

The Doctrine it ſelf I think is guilty of it: For when you have denied [*Taking Chriſt for Lord*] to have the *neceſſity* of a *Condition* (or Cauſe) and then ſay, it is *neceſſary* for all that; you either con-

tradict your self, or you mean no such *Moral necessity*, but that a man may be saved without it. Nay, you say, that men are *first justified* by taking Christ as *Priest*, and *after* take him for King: And so a *Christ-dividing Faith*, which is *no true Faith*, should justifie, and the taking him as King should not be necessary *ne quoad præsentiam*. And when you have taught wicked men, that it justifieth them to accept of Christ as Priest, to justifie and save them, and they *are willing of that* unfeignedly, will you make them believe they are *unjustified again*, because the accepting Christ as King doth not follow it? Or will you shew them why they are not justified, when neither Cause nor Condition is wanting? What an effect is that which will not be produced, when there is all the Causes and Conditions?

Why is it that *accepting Christ as King* must of *necessity* follow? All *necessity* hath *some Reason*. And if you would perswade either them or me, that they do *not accept* of Christ's *Satisfaction* to *justifie* them (which you say is the Condition) and that they do but dissemble, neither they nor I can believe you. *They feel* the contrary, and *I know it*. I never knew man in my life that was unwilling to be pardoned and justified, or willing to be damned. Indeed properly it cannot be called [*Acceptance*,] because that presupposeth an *offer*: And Christ as Priest only, is offered to none, but a willingness so to have him it is.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 327. *Surely the easiness of the former; (viz. to expect Justification from Christ alone:) and the difficulty of the latter; (viz. to take Christ for Lord) seemeth to tell us, that it is a spiritual, excellent, necessary part of justifying Faith.*

Animadvers.

Perhaps for [*spiritual*] should be [*special*:] But however, 1. It doth not appear to be so easie a thing to expect Justification from Christ alone: The Jews of old were averse from it, *Rom.* 9. 31, 32. and so are the Papists generally at this day, and others also besides them. 2. I see not how there is more difficulty in taking Christ for our Lord, if we make it a part of justifying Faith, than if we make it (as I suppose we should) a *fruit* of it.

Reply.

[Spiritual] for [special] was a misprinting; a thing very frequent in that Book. 1. You might perceive that I speak not of the difficulty of *assenting to the truth* of Christ's *Priestly Office*, but of the *Wills Consent* or *Acceptance*, supposing the *Assent*. It is as difficult for the *Understanding to believe Christ's Priestly Office*, as his *Kingly*: The Jews believed neither. I never met with a Papist, but would say, He trusted only in the Merits of Christ; therefore they be not generally at this day, so bad in this as they are made. *Rivet* saith (and so do many more of our Divines, citing the same passage, as *Amef.* &c.) that the Jesuites themselves admit, *Rectam esse nostram sententiam, si intelligamus, nobis imputari Christi merita, quia nobis donata sunt, & possimus*

poſſimus ea Deo patri offerre pro noſtris peccatis, quoniam Chriſtus ſuſcepit per ſe onus ſatisfaciendi pro nobis, noſq; Deo Patri reconciliandi. They are *Bellarmine's* words, *Lib. 2. de Juſtif. c. 7.* And *Rivet* adds, [*Quæ certe noſtra eſt ex parte ſententia, quanquam aliam nobis affingat de juſtitia Chriſti tanquam cauſa formali.* Riv. Diſp. 10. de fide Juſtif. §. 13. p. 190. And *Vignerius* and other Papiſts ordinarily ſay, that *Man's Works are not neceſſary to ſupply any defect in Chriſt's Satisfaction (for it is perfect) but only for the application of it to our ſelves.* And how many of them deny *Merit*, in ſenſe, you know: Yet I excuſe none of their errours.

But that which I ſpeak of is the compleat act of *juſtifying Faith in the Will:* When men *believe* Chriſt to be the *Mediator*, and his *Word* to be *true*, (which wicked men may do, ſeeing the Devils do it) it is not then ſo hard a matter to make them *willing* to take him for their *Juſtifier*, as to take him for their *Ruler*. I know there is in man a natural Pride, by which he would be beholden to none. But when men are convinced that they are ſinners, and they cannot pardon themſelves, nor any ſave them but Chriſt; I think it is no hard matter to make them willing that Chriſt ſhould pardon and ſave them. I ſay again, *No man can be willing to be damned* or *unpardoned*, that knows theſe. I know never a wicked man about me, but is willing to be pardoned and ſaved by Chriſt.

2. I am fully of your mind in your ſecond note: but I know not to what purpoſe it was. I think it is leſs difficult to take Chriſt for our Lord, when we know it to be the *Condition of Pardon* (for then

then we have a potent *motive* to it) then when we say, *It is no such Condition* (and so lose our motive:) Yet Natures averseness is a-like to the thing it self; but that in one respect we have God's means to overcome it, and not in the other.

If taking Christ for Lord, be but *a fruit* of justifying Faith; then, 1. We are justified *before* it, that is, before we take Christ as Christ. 2. And then it would have done well if you had shewed the *Moral necessity* of that fruit? what it is, if not a *Condition*? and why a man may not be saved without it. He that is justified, is in a state of Salvation (say you, truly;) and therefore should be saved, if he so died: But he that only taketh Christ for Priest, say you, is justified: (for the fruit followeth the Cause) therefore he should be saved, *&c.*

Aphorism.

Page 329. *IS not this excluding of* sincere Obedience *from* Justification; *The great stumbling-block of Papists, and that which hath had a great hand in turning many Learned men from the Protestant Religion to Popery?*

Animadvers.

So the preaching of Christ crucified, and of Justification through Faith in him, was the great stumbling-block of the Jews, 1 *Cor.* 1. 23. *Rom.* 9. 31, 32. Yet the Apostle preached and pressed this Doctrine for all that; and so must we, though the Papists be offended at it: *Melius enim est ut scandalum oriatur, quam ut veritas relinquatur.* Bernard. Epist. 34.

Reply.

The Question is, of *Scandal given*: The Answer is of *Scandal taken*. The Question is of *Scandal by Errour*: The Answer is of *Scandal by the Truth*. *Paul*'s Doctrine did set up the Lord *Jesus Christ* against *man's Works*; but not *Jesus* against or without the *Lord Christ*, nor one *single act* of *man's* (*Faith*) against *other acts*; (as Love) about the same Object. This was the Jews offence, which is far from that Question: They were not offended that one act of man was advanced above all the rest; (for *Paul* did not that, it was none of his design to advance Faith above Love, *&c.*) but that Christ was advanced against their own supposed Legal Righteousness, (which was *Paul*'s work: Nor did *Paul* lay all on the *Instrumentality* or *natural use* of Faith; (*viz.* that it is *Apprehensio Christi, i. e. fides*:) as if it justified but in a *natural* consideration, and not in a *moral*: Nor yet did he ascribe Justification to *Affiance* as the sole act, excluding *ab officio Assent* and *Acceptance*, nor to any one of these alone.

Aphorism.

Page 330,331. *DO these men think, that we are perfectly justified and saved already?*

Animadver.

Perfectly justified, I think, we are already, though not perfectly saved. If sin be not, and Righteousness be imputed to us, and we are freed from all Condemnation (and so it is with us if we are true Believers) then we are perfectly justified.

Reply.

Reply.

To this I have ſpoke oft enough. If you are ſo perfectly juſtified, then you need no more Juſtification. But you need more: 1. You need that the New-Law or Covenant ſhould juſtifie you every day. In Teſtaments, Laws, *&c.* the act as continued, is as truly an act as the firſt. 2. You need that Chriſt ſhould juſtifie you *per Apologiam* now. 3. And at *Judgment*, 4. And *per ſententiam* then.

Aphoriſm.

THis *Doctrine was offenſive to* Melancthon, Bucer, *and other moderate Divines.*

Animadverſ.

What Doctrine? that of Juſtification by Faith without Works? Where do they take offence at it? *Bellarmine* (as I have noted before) doth cite *Melancthon* among others, as teaching that Faith alone doth juſtifie, though Faith, which juſtifieth, be not alone, but accompanied with good Works. And if *Bucer* had taught otherwiſe, *Bellarmine* would have been ſure to have found it out, and to have told us of it. B. *Davenant* notes it as a calumny of the Papiſts, that none of our Writers, except *Bucer* and *Chemnitius*, do acknowledg any inherent Righteouſneſs in thoſe that are juſtified. *Omnes* (*enim*) *agnoſcimus* (ſaith he) *& clare profitemur Deum infundere hujuſmodi juſtitiam in ipſo actu juſtificandi; ſed negamus ſententiam Dei Juſtificantis ad hanc reſpicere tanquam ad cauſam, per quam homo Juſtificatus conſtituitur.* Dav. de Juſt. Hab. c. 22. p. 312. If perhaps you mean that *Melancthon*, *Bucer*, and others, took offence at the Doctrine of *Illyricus*, and ſome others, who accounted it Here-

sie to say, that Good-works are necessary to Salvation, as you say they did, *page* 329. I answer, It is one thing to say, that Good-works are necessary to Salvation; another thing to say, that they are necessary to Justification. For Justification must go before Good-works, such as are not only good in themselves, but also good as done by us: But Good-works must go before Salvation, I mean the full and perfect accomplishment of it.

Reply.

I mean the Doctrine of them that deny Obedience to be a Condition of Salvation, or of final Justification at Judgment, and so by denying the *grounds* of their *necessity*, bring men to wicked lives. I suppose in this speech the truth of *Thesis* 78. that our full Justification, and our Glorification, have on our part the same Conditions; and therefore for all you say, it is a denying both, or granting both consequentially, to deny or grant one. I doubt *Illyricus* Doctrine was the same in sense with this: For he denied not *Good-works* to be *necessary* (as at large you may see in *Schlusselburgius contra Majoristas*;) but that they were *necessary to Justification or Salvation*, that is, he thought them (as you speak) necessary fruits of Faith; but not *necessary means*, (i. e. *Conditions*) of *Salvation*.

For *Bucer*, I suppose, you have read what passed between *Rivet* and *Grotius* about him. See also *Colloq. Ratisbon. p.* 302,308,313,567. *Illud solum in quæstione de Mercede bonorum operum controversum est, An sit in bonis operibus renatorum aliquod meritum condignum Mercede, quam eis Deus retribuit? Nam vitam æternam reddi fidelibus bene operantibus,*

bus, etiam Coronæ & Mercedis loco, nos ſemper dedimus.

For *Melancti. vid. Apolog. pro Confeſſ. Auguſt. in Art.* 20. *& in Operum Tom.* 2. *loc. de Bonis Oper. Nova obedientia eſt neceſſaria, neceſſitate ordinis, cauſæ, & effectûs : item neceſſitate debiti ſeu mandati. Item neceſſitate retinendæ fidei —— & vitandi pœnas temporales & æternas.* Et in Epiſt. Lugd. edit. 1647. p. 453. he contends, that to ſpeak exactly *Agnitio peccatorum* is not *cauſa ſecunda Remiſſionis* (that Mercy is the ſole efficient neareſt cauſe :) But it is *cauſa ſine qua non*; and makes that to be his uſual phraſe. And that's as much as I; for that's a *Condition of Remiſſion.* Vid. & Epiſt. 19. p. 455. & p. 438. *Cordatus urbem, vicinas etiam Regiones, & ipſam aulam adverſus me concitat, propterea quod in explicanda controverſia Juſtificationis, dixi novam obedientiam neceſſariam eſſe ad ſalutem,* &c. And *page* 446. he adviſeth to preach the *praiſes* of Good-works rather in *Sermons of Repentance*, becauſe he obſerved that many of ours would bear the *ſame Doctrine there*, which they would not in the point of *Juſtification.* See alſo *Camerar.* and *Melch. Adamus* in his Life.

Davenant's words cited, have nothing that I diſlike (but only that Grace is ſaid to be infuſed *in ipſo actu Juſtificandi*, when the acts are of various natures: But I ſuppoſe he means, *de tempore* only. The reſt is before oft replied to.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Page 332. *Works (or a purpose to walk with God)* saith Mr. *Ball* on the Covenant, *page 73.*) *do justifie, as the passive Qualification of the subject capable of Justification.*

Animadvers.

But you leave out the words which Mr. *Ball* immediately addeth to explain himself the better; viz. [*Or as the Qualification of that Faith that justifieth, or as they testifie and give proof that Faith is lively: But Faith alone justifieth, as it embraceth the free promise of free forgiveness in Jesus Christ.* And in the very same page, Mr. *Ball* hath these words, which are as express against you as may be: [*So that we may conclude from this passage of holy Writ, that* Abraham *was justified by Faith alone: But this his Faith though alone in the act of Justification, no other Grace working with it, was not alone* in existence, *did not lie dead in him, as a dormant and idle Quality.*

Reply.

1. I left out all the rest of his Book too: But the Reader may see all at pleasure.

2. Doth that you add gain-say what I cited? If not, take it in as favourable a sense to you as the words will bear.

3. I allow also of the explicatory terms (as you judg them to be) which you add.

4. But I never undertook to shew, that Mr. *Ball* and I were just of a judgment in this point: But only that he gives as much as I do to Works (and more;) but more than I do to Faith. He yieldeth both

both *Faith* and *Works* to be the *Condition of Justification* (which is the thing that you deny;) but he affirmeth Faith to be moreover the *instrumental Cause* of Justification (which you will not own any more than I.) Lest you think I wrong him, see *page* 20. [*A disposition to Good-works is necessary to Justification, being the Qualification of an active and lively Faith: Good-works of all sorts are necessary to our continuance in the state of Justification, and so to our final Absolution, if God give opportunity. But they are not the cause of, but only a precedent Qualification* or *Condition to final forgiveness, and to eternal bliss. If then, when we speak of the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace, by* [*Condition*] *we understand whatsoever is required on our part, as precedent, concomitant, or subsequent to Justification; Repentance, Faith and Obedience are all Conditions: But if by* [*Condition*] *we understand what is required on our part as the cause of the good promised, though only instrumental; Faith or Belief in the promises of free-mercy, is the only Condition.*

So *page* 21. [*This* walking in the Light, as he is in the Light, *is that Qualification whereby we become immediately capable of Christ's Righteousness, or actual Participants of his Propitiation, which is the sole immediate cause of our Justification, taken for remission of sins, or actual approbation with God.*] This is more than I say.

Aphorism.

See *Calvin* on *Luke* 1. 6.

Anim.

Animadverſ.

I can ſee nothing there for you; but ſomething againſt you, [*Juſti ergo & irreprehenſibiles cenſentur quoniam tota vita teſtatur eos Juſtitiæ addictos eſſe*, &c. *Sed quia à perfectione longe diſtat pium eorum ſtudium, non poteſt ſine venia placere Deo. Quare juſtitia quæ in illis laudatur, à gratuita Dei indulgentia pendet; qua fit, ut quod reliquum eſt, in ipſis injuſtitiæ, non imputet. Sic exponere neceſſe eſt quicquid de hominum juſtitia in Scripturis habetur, ut remiſſionem peccatorum non evertat; cui non aliter innititur, quam ſuo fundamento ædificium.* Here *Calvin*, 1. Denies perſonal Righteouſneſs to be perfect, and ſuch, as without pardoning mercy can pleaſe God. 2. He makes this perſonal Righteouſneſs to follow Juſtification; and to relie upon it, as a building doth on its foundation: Therefore according to *Calvin* in this place (for his judgment in this point is otherwiſe well known) perſonal Righteouſneſs is not that whereby we are juſtified.

Reply.

I own all that which you judg againſt me. And to your Obſervations, 1. So do I deny perſonal Righteouſneſs to be *materially perfect*, and in divers other reſpects mentioned in the Aphoriſm. All that *Calvin* drives at is, that it is a *Righteouſneſs* that ſtands with ſin and pardon, which who dare deny? But did *Calvin* deny the Metaphyſical *perfection of Being*, as to the *Relation* of [*Righteous*,] or yet the Relation of [*præſtitor conditionis novæ Legis*,] whereon it is grounded?

2. So do I ſay, that this *Righteouſneſs follows Juſtification*, and receives much of its force from it, (that the perſon be reconciled:) But yet may it not go *before* it *quoad continuationem & ſententiam judicis?*

judicis? *Calvin* maintaineth a true personal Righteousness, consisting with necessity of pardon of sin, and so do I. His main Caution is, that we feign not any Righteousness inconsistent with pardon; and that who doth not abhor? Your Conclusion therefore is merely your own.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *THe common Assertion, that [Good-works do follow Justification, and not go before it,] must be thus understood, or it is false*; viz. *Actual Obedience goeth not before the first moment of Justification*, &c.

Animadverf.

By this which you here grant it follows, that Justification is by Faith alone, without Works; though they also will follow in their time and order.

Reply.

True: If you mean it of external Works, and of the beginning of Justification. Do you need to tell me of a Consequence, which I so oft professedly maintain, as if it followed against my mind? But as this excludes not Repentance, Love to Christ, *&c.* from our first Justification; so nor outward Works from the continued and sentential Justification at Judgment, as Conditions of both.

Aphor.

Aphorism.

Ibid. *But yet it is as true, 1. That the taking Christ for our Lord, and so delivering up our selves to his Government (which is the subjection of the heart, and resolution for further Obedience, and indeed an essential part of Faith) doth in order of nature go before our first Justification.*

Animadvers.

1. *Viz.* As the Qualification of that Faith which justifies, as Mr. *Ball* in the place before cited speaks.

2. But Christ as having satisfied for our sins, is received by us unto Justification.

3. Faith which justifieth, doth receive Christ in respect of all his Offices: But Faith justifieth as it receiveth Christ as a Priest, making satisfaction for us; by which Satisfaction laid hold on by Faith, and so imputed to us, we are justified.

Reply.

1. I yield to your first from Mr. *Ball* (as to those acts that are not essential;) but have proved already, that the *Qualification* of Faith is *part of the Condition*, and so it hath the *necessity-moral* of a *Condition* (as *current English money* in a Bond:) And not only a *natural necessity* (as it is necessary an entire man have *two hands*, &c.) The Condition is, not only that we *Believe*, but that we *affectionately believe*, &c.

2. I yet see no reason to think, *Taking Christ as King to be less essential to justifying Faith*, than taking him

him as Prieſt. Your ſecond Propoſition is true, but nothing againſt me.

3. And the ſame I ſay of the next, [*Faith juſtifieth as it receiveth Chriſt as Prieſt,*] except you add [*only.*]

4. That which mars all your diſcourſe is, 1. The confounding two Queſtions, *What juſtifieth* ex parte objecti? and what *ex parte actus noſtri?* It is Chriſt's *Satisfaction*, and not his *Kingſhip* that juſtifieth *meritoriouſly*; it is Chriſt as *Advocate* that *juſtifies Apologetically*; it is *Chriſt as Judg* that *juſtifies Sententially*: As it is Chriſt (and the Father in him) that *per novum fœdus*, juſtifieth Conſtitutively *efficienter*. But *ex parte actus*, *Faith* juſtifieth *quatenus conditio iſtius fœderis*: And that Faith which is the *Condition*, is the receiving our Lord Jeſus Chriſt the Redeemer entirely.

2. You are brought to confeſs, that Faith is the *Condition of Juſtification* (and I think that it juſtifies *qua conditio præſtita*) and yet you ſeem to retain a notion in your mind, as if it *juſtified qua fides* in its *natural Capacity*: As if the *Ratio materialis vel Aptitudinalis*, were nearer the effect than the *Formalis*.

Aphoriſm.

Ibid. 2. *THat actual Obedience, as part of the Condition, doth in order of nature go before our Juſtification as continued and confirmed.*

Anim.

Animadverſ.

Juſtification is not continued nor confirmed, without actual Obedience; yet Juſtification is continued by the continuance of Faith, though this continuance of Faith, and ſo of Juſtification, be not without the co-exiſtence of actual Obedience, which Obedience doth make for the confirmation of Faith, and ſo of our Juſtification, as being a proof and evidence of that Faith by which we are juſtified.

Reply.

Here is nothing againſt me: For want of the word [*Only*] after [*Continuance of Faith:*] Which if you meant, I have given my Reaſons againſt it before, and am ready to do it much more fully, as being a point that I am confident in.

Aphoriſm.

Page 313. 3. *That perſeverance in faithful Obedience, doth both in nature and time go before our full, compleat and final Juſtification; and that as a part of the Condition of obtaining it:* If we walk in the Light, *&c.* 1 *John* 1. 7. *Iſa.* 1. 16, 17. Ezek. 33. 14, 15, 16. & 18. 21, 22.

Animadverſ.

Our Juſtification (as I have often noted before) is full here, though it be not fully manifeſted till hereafter. The places of Scripture which you alledg, ſpeak of Juſtification as it is here obtained; and they ſhew *who* are juſtified, not *by what* they are juſtified.

Reply.

Reply.

1. I have oft enough told you, that this is your great errour: As if Justification were only *unius generis*, and *sentential* were *none*.

2. If those Texts speak but *de nudis signis*, any Antinomian may as well say the like of any Text you shall bring for Faith's justifying. I know they speak not of *Causes*, but they speak plainly of Conditions.

Aphorism.

In *Append.* page 120. *IS not Faith a work or act of ours?*

Animadvers.

It is not the act of Faith apprehending, but the Object or thing apprehended, *viz.* Christ's Righteousness, which doth formally justifie. Only Faith or Believing is said to justifie, because Christ's Righteousness, except it be apprehended by Faith, is not available to our Justification. Something before out of B. *Davenant* I have cited to this purpose, to which I add that which he saith *de Just. Hab. cap.* 28. *page* 371. *Nihil usitatius quam causæ applicanti illud tribuere, quod propriè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam. Quia igitur fides apprehendit & applicat nobis Christi justitiam, id fidei ipsi tribuitur quod reapse Christo debetur.*

Reply.

1. If indeed this be your meaning, that it is not *Faith* by which we are justified at all, but *Christ*, the Dispute is vain, *How Faith justifies?* and *Whether*

ther Faith alone? if be *not Faith* at all. What have we done all this while? But I cannot believe that when you say, [*Faith justifies as a Condition*, or *Apprehension*, or (as others say) as an *Instrument*,] that by [*Faith* is meant [*Christ*,] as if *he* were the *Condition*, *Apprehension* and *Instrument*.

2. I am not of your mind, that *Christ's Righteousness* doth *formally* justifie; but rather, *meritoriously* or *materially*. Remember the place which I cited even now out of *Rivet* where he blames *Bellarmine* for fastening your conceit on us.

3. Is it not utter obscurity to say, [*Believing is said to justifie, only because Christ's Righteousness, except apprehended*, &c.] Oh that you had told me here what the *moral Office* or *Interest* of Faith is in this work! and why Christ's Righteousness cannot justifie without apprehension? I know but two Opinions that are worth the mentioning: Some say, [*Because Faith is an Instrument*;] or as others, that see the impropriety of this, [*Because it is* conditio naturaliter necessaria, *as the hands taking a Pearl*;] and not *moraliter ex constitutione donantis*. This Opinion I have by very many Arguments confuted in another place. 2. That it is of *natural convenience*, and *moral necessity*. It would have been inconvenient to have given Remission upon Christ's Satisfaction to any without Faith; yet God could have done it, had he pleased, and removed some causes of the inconveniency. But the immediate Reason of Faith's interest, is, that the Donor hath made it the Condition. This is my Judgment, which I have fullier elsewhere explained and proved. *Davenant*'s words are not against me.

Anim.

Animadverſ.

Manton on *James* 2. 23. [For thoſe great Diſputes about the matter of Juſtification, I would not intermeddle, let it ſuffice to note, That the general current of *Paul*'s Epiſtles carrieth it for the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt; which being imputed to us, maketh us juſt and acceptable before God; and this Righteouſneſs we receive by Faith. So that Faith juſtifieth not in the Popiſh ſenſe, as a moſt perfect Grace, or as a good Work done by us; but in it's relation to Chriſt, as it receiveth Chriſt's ſatisfactory Righteouſneſs, And ſo whether you ſay it juſtifieth as an Inſtrument, a ſole working Inſtrument, or as an Ordinance or Relative Action required on our part, all is to the ſame iſſue and purpoſe. To contend about mere words, and bare forms of ſpeech, is to be too preciſe and critical.

Reply.

To Mr. *Manton* I ſay, 1. If it be all one whether we ſay, An Inſtrument, an Ordinance, or Relative Action required on our parts, then I much differ not from you: For I dare call it ſo, [*A Relative Act required on our parts.*] But,

2. I conceive that [*A Relative Act*] is a dark Expreſſion: *What Relation* hath it to Chriſt? doth it juſtifie *qua related* to Chriſt? then why do not many other acts related to Chriſt juſtifie? For my part, I think, when the nature of *Faith*, and of *Juſtification*, and of a *Condition*, is well underſtood, it will appear that we have no proper name in uſe to expreſs the *Formalem Rationem* of Faith's intereſt in Juſtification, but the term [*Condition*,] as it is uſed by Lawyers; or, *Cauſa ſine qua non, & cum quâ, ex neceſſitate morali.*

3. Do not those contend about words (and mistaking ones) that contend so much for Faith's *Instrumentality* in justifying? Words must be fitted to things. It is far from a mere contention about words, in the sense as I use it: Whether it be receiving Christ only *as Priest* that *justifieth?* is a material Question; and so are many more that follow.

Animadvers.

Præceptum & prohibitio ad Voluntatem pracipientem: operatio autem & permissio ad voluntatem decernentem pertinent. Trigland. de Volunt. Dei, p. 159. *Præceptum* (*quo Deus* Abrahamo *præcepit, ut filium suum immolaret*) *erat signum, non voluntatis decernentis, quasi Deus decrevisset quid certò fieri deberet, cujus per signum est operatio Divina, & ex illa rei eventus: Sed voluntatis exigentis, & hujus verum erat & indubitatum signum: Verè enim & seriò Deus ab* Abrahamo *exigebat, ut adeo se morigerum ei exhiberet, & vel unigenito suo filio ipsius causâ non parceret.* Trigland. ibid. p. 161.

Voluntas signi (as Precept, or Prohibition, or Operation, or Permission is so called) is not properly *Voluntas*, but only *signum Voluntatis*; yet there is a *Voluntas*, of which those are signs; viz. *Voluntas præcipiens*, the signs whereof are Precept and Prohibition; and *Voluntas decernens*, the signs whereof are Operation and Permission.

Reply.

I am glad to see *Triglandius* speak the same as I do, and that you in your following words exactly agree with me in that point; asserting both a proper *immanent Will de Debito*, distinct from that *de Eventu*; and a *signal Will de Debito*, metonymically so called.

I

I came but even now from heaping up forty Testimonies of our Divines that speak as I, and am loth to do that work again, unless it were more useful: But I remember I promised you something of *Davenant*'s, because you oft mention him: And it is not any Sentences on the by, but his judgment fully and purposely delivered in Propositions, with their proof, how far Good-works are necessary. De Justit. Habit & Act. c. 30. p. 384. [1. *Bona opera sunt necessaria omnibus fidelibus & Justificatis, qui habent usum rationis & per ætatem operari possunt.*] *Lege sequentia.* Et cap. 31. p. 403. Concluf. 5. [*Bona quædam opera sunt necessaria ad Justificationem, ut conditiones concurrentes vel præcursoriæ, licet non sint necessariæ ut causæ efficientes aut meritoriæ*] *Lege probat.* Concluf. 6. p. 404. *Bona opera sunt necessaria ad Justificationis statum retinendum & conservandum; Non ut causæ quæ per se efficiant aut mereantur hanc conservationem: Sed ut media seu conditiones, sine quibus Deus non vult Justificationis gratiam in hominibus conservare.*] Vide probat. seq. Concluf. 7. p. 405. *Bona opera Justificatorum sunt ad salutem necessaria necessitate ordinis, non causalitatis: Vel planius, ut via ordinata ad vitam æternam, non ut causæ meritoriæ vitæ æternæ.* Vid. & pag. 570, 571, 572, 633.

You may see here, if you will be of *Davenant*'s mind, you must be of mine in this: He gives to Works the very same Office as I do, neither more nor less. If he do give any more than I to *Faith*, (as he doth in calling it an *Instrument*; but I

think it is Metaphorically only that he means) that is all the difference. I undertake to manifest, that our greatest Divines ordinarily give to Works as much as I: But indeed I give not to *Faith* (and to *man*) so much as they; not daring to make man his own Justifier and Pardoner, or his *Act* to be the *Instrument* of *God's Act* of justifying, or of producing the same effect. Who can forgive sins but God only? If he have any Instruments, it is his *Gospel* properly, and his *Ministers remotely*, and less properly.

Finitur, Jun. 18. 1652.

Postscript.

TO the two Great Points in difference, let me speak this word more:

1. Those that make Faith to justifie as an *Instrument*, or as *Apprehensio Christi*, do set up the τὸ *Credere* which they cry down. For that which they call *Instrumentality*, is the *Apprehensive Act*: And *Apprehendere* and *Credere* are here all one; and therefore if the *Apprehension* of Christ justifieth *qua Apprehensio*, or *qua Acceptatio*, then the τὸ *Credere qua talis* justifies.

2. And those that teach this Doctrine, do contradict themselves in saying, that

Paul excludes *all Works*; becauſe Faith (ſay they) juſtifieth not *as a Work:* For to juſtifie *qua Inſtrumentum vel qua Apprehenſio Chriſti*, is to juſtifie as a *Work*, or as *this Work*. For they cannot ſpeak *de Inſtrumenti materia:* For, 1. Faith (the act) can be no *material* Inſtrument. 2. The whole formal nature of inſtrumental Cauſe, lieth in its actual Application by the principal cauſe: And before that Application it is only an Aptitudinal Inſtrument, or apt to be an Inſtrument; but is not one formally and indeed. Now the Cauſation of Inſtruments is *per Operationem vel Actionem*; And therefore if Faith juſtifie as an *Inſtrumental Cauſe*, then it muſt needs juſtifie as *Opus* or *Actio*.

3. And ſo this Doctrine ſets up Juſtification by Works, againſt which the Authors ſeem ſo zealous: (The unhappy fate of many Errours, to ſet up what they are the extream oppoſers of;) and that in an unlawful ſenſe: For it makes the formal reaſon of Faith's juſtifying to be *its Apprehenſion*, that is, that it is *ſuch an Action*; or its *Inſtrumentality*, which is *an Operation*. Whereas I only affirm (with Scripture) that Obedience

Obedience to Christ justifies, not *qua Obedience*, or *qua Opus*, but as the *Condition* to which the free Lawgiver hath been pleased to annex Justification.

2. Against yours (and the common) conceit, [That there is such a difference between *Justification* and *right to Salvation*, that Faith alone procures one, and Works concur to the other.] Besides all that I have said, let me desire you to observe, that *Paul* speaks as fully and directly of *right to Salvation*, as of *Justification*; and *excludes Works* as much (and more) from the one as from the other.

1. *Rom.* 3. 23, 24. *Justification freely by Grace*, is opposed to [*coming short of the Glory of God.*]

2. *Rom.* 4. 4. *Paul* expressly speaks of [the *Reward given of Grace, and not of Debt*;] and therefore excludeth those Works. But, 1. *Salvation* is the *Reward* as well as *Justification*; and therefore this Reason equally excludeth Works from *saving* as from *justifying*. 2. Yea, if their Doctrine

Doctrine were true, that say it is *only Salvation*, and not *Pardon* and *Justification*, that is given *per modum premii*, as a *Reward*, then this Text would not concern Justification at all, but only *Salvation*. (But doubtless it doth concern Justification also; and therefore this is another good Argument, that Faith justifieth not *qua Instrumentum vel Apprehensio, proxime, sed qua Conditio præstita*, because Justification is given as a Reward; and *Rewards* are given on *Moral* Considerations, and not merely Physical.

3. *Rom.* 4. 13. *Paul* speaks of the *Inheritance*: *If they which be of the Law be Heirs, then Faith is made void*, &c.

4. *Rom.* 4. 16. *It is of Faith, that it might be by Grace, that the Promise might be sure to all the Seed*, &c. But doubtless this *Promise* is the *Promise of Salvation*.

5. So *Rom.* 5. 17, 18. [*Reigning in Life by Jesus Christ,*] is opposed to *Death reigning by* Adam: And lest there should be any room left to doubting, he expressly calleth

leth it, [*Justification of Life.*] And *ver.* 21. *Even so might Grace reign through Righteousness to eternal Life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.*

Object. *But* Vers. 9, 10. *the Apostle distinguisheth* Reconciliation *and* Salvation, *and maketh the* latter follow.

Answ. 1. But he saith not so *de statu salutis*, or of *right to Salvation*, but only of *actual Salvation* it self.

2. He still makes them both the fruits of the free Grace of Christ, and so excludes Works as much from Salvation as Justification: Nay he saith, [*Much more shall we be saved by his Life.*]

6. *Rom.* 6. 23. *The free Gift is* (not only *Righteousness*) *but eternal Life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.* And Life as free as Righteousness.

7. *Rom.* 8. 1, 2, 6. Freedom from the *Law of Death* as well as *sin*, is made equivalent to [*no Condemnation:*] And as Christ Jesus is the meritorious Cause, so that you may

Doctrine were true, that ſay it is *only Salvation*, and not *Pardon* and *Juſtification*, that is given *per modum premii*, as a *Reward*, then this Text would not concern Juſtification at all, but only *Salvation*. (But doubtleſs it doth concern Juſtification alſo; and therefore this is another good Argument, that Faith juſtifieth not *qua Inſtrumentum vel Apprehenſio, proxime, ſed qua Conditio præſtita*, becauſe Juſtification is given as a Reward; and *Rewards* are given on *Moral* Conſiderations, and not merely Phyſical.

3. *Rom.* 4. 13. *Paul* ſpeaks of the *Inheritance: If they which be of the Law be Heirs, then Faith is made void*, &c.

4. *Rom.* 4. 16. *It is of Faith, that it might be by Grace, that the Promiſe might be ſure to all the Seed*, &c. But doubtleſs this *Promiſe* is the *Promiſe of Salvation.*

5. So *Rom.* 5. 17, 18. [*Reigning in Life by Jeſus Chriſt,*] is oppoſed to *Death reigning by* Adam: And leſt there ſhould be any room left to doubting, he expreſly cal-

ler'h

leth it, [*Juſtification of Life.*] And *ver.* 21. *Even ſo might Grace reign through Righteouſneſs to eternal Life, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.*

Object. *But* Verſ. 9, 10. *the Apoſtle diſtinguiſheth* Reconciliation *and* Salvation, *and maketh the* latter follow.

Anſw. 1. But he ſaith not ſo *de ſtatu ſalutis*, or of *right to Salvation*, but only of *actual Salvation* it ſelf.

2. He ſtill makes them both the fruits of the free Grace of Chriſt, and ſo excludes Works as much from Salvation as Juſtification: Nay he ſaith, [*Much more ſhall we be ſaved by his Life.*]

6. *Rom.* 6. 23. *The free Gift is* (not only *Righteouſneſs*) *but eternal Life, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.* And Life as free as Righteouſneſs.

7. *Rom.* 8. 1, 2, 6. Freedom from the *Law of Death* as well as *ſin*, is made equivalent to [*no Condemnation:*] And as Chriſt Jeſus is the meritorious Cauſe, ſo that you may

may ſee that *only Faith* is not the *Condition*. *Verſ.* 1. it's ſaid, [*To be ſpiritually-minded is Life and Peace*:] Life as well as Righteouſneſs. So *Verſ.* 13, 14, 17.

8. *Hebr.* 11. throughout, ſpeaks more expreſly of *Salvation* by *Faith*, than *Juſtification*: And therefore the very Definition more reſpecteth *Salvation*, verſ. 1. *Faith is the ſubſtance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not ſeen.* And *verſe* 13. which you take to contain a Definition of it, ſaith, *Theſe all died in Faith, not having received the Promiſes, but*, &c. Theſe *Promiſes*, *i. e.* the thing promiſed is certainly *more in Salvation* than *Juſtification* (which they then had.) I could name a multitude more plain Texts, but I will add but two, wherein the Apoſtle of purpoſe extolleth Free-Grace, and excludeth Works, and expreſly doth it as to our *Salvation*, equally as to our *Juſtification*.

9. The one is, *Tit.* 3. 4, 5, 6, 7. *But after the kindneſs and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by Works of Righteouſneſs which we have done, but according*

to

his mercy he saved us, &c. *that being justified by his Grace, we should be made Heirs according to the hope of eternal Life.*

10. And *Ephes.* 2. 4,5,6,7,8,9. *But God who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in trespasses and sins, hath quickned us together with Christ: By Grace ye are saved. And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: that in the ages to come, he might shew the exceeding riches of his Grace in his kindness towards us through Christ Jesus. For by Grace ye are* saved *through Faith; and that not of your selves, it is the gift of God: Not of Works, lest any man should boast.*

Did ever the Apostle more fully and and expresly exclude Works from *Justification*, than here he doth from *saving us?* or make *Justification* of free Grace, more than here he doth *Salvation?* I shall therefore take leave still confidently to conclude, That *it is no more wrong to Christ and Free-Grace to say, That Obedience justifieth as a Condition; than to*

say,

say, It saveth as a Condition: And that as oft as Scripture makes it a *Condition of Salvation*, it certainly giveth us proof, that it is *a Condition of final Absolution or Justification:* And that it never was the mind of *Paul* or the Holy Ghost, to distinguish so far between the *way to Justification*, and the *right to Salvation*, as you do; or to make one more free than the other.

FINIS.

EXCEPTIONS
Against a
VVRITING
OF
Mr. *R. BAXTERS*,
In Answer to some
ANIMADVERSIONS
Upon his
APHORISMS.

By Mr. *Chr. Cartwright* of *York*.

LONDON,
Printed for *Nevil Simmons* and *Jonath. Robinson*, at the Princes-Arms and Golden-Lion, in St. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1675.

309:04

Exceptions againſt a Writing of Mr. R. Baxters, *in Anſwer to ſome Animadverſions upon his Aphoriſms.*

HOw Relations ſhould be *inter Entia & Nihil* I cannot ſee; For *Nihil* is *Non ens*; & *inter ens & non ens non datur medium.* Page 2. l. 2.

Εὐδοκία is indeed for moſt part ſo taken, as to include Love and Good-will; yet it ſeems to be otherwiſe taken *Matth.* 11. 26. and *Luke* 10. 21. as *Dr. Twiſſe* obſerveth. And it is true, Εὐδοκία & *Beneplacitum* expreſs one the other: yet if we conſider the propriety of the words, both of them may well ſignifie the Will and Pleaſure of God concerning any thing whatſoever. It is obſerved, that the Lxx Interpreters deviſed the word Εὐδοκέω to expreſs the Hebrew *Ratſa*, which is as much as *Velle*; though it be often uſed for *Benevolum eſſe*. The Members of that diſtinction, [*Gratia gratum faciens, & Gratia gratis data*] fall one into another, as well as the Members of this, [*Voluntas Beneplaciti, & Voluntas Signi*] yet the diſtinction, though not ſo exact, may be uſeful. 4. *Vindic. Lib.* 1. *Part.* 2. *Sect.* 20.

1. What you intended, I know not; but you ſeem to ſpeak alike of all the Signs mentioned, *Aphor.* p. 3. *Ibid.*

2. I find *Aquinas* expreſs for this, that *Voluntas Signi*, is but *Signum Voluntatis*; ſo that according to him *Voluntas Beneplaciti* ſeems indeed to ſignifie the whole Will of God, properly ſo called; and *Voluntas Signi* the whole Will of God alſo, ſo far forth as there is any ſignification of it. But however, I ſee not how you can hence infer, [then *impletio voluntatis beneplaciti de præſenti, non eſt ſignum voluntatis beneplaciti de jure*]. This ſeems but a meer evaſion; it ſufficeth, that *Imple-* 3. *Part* 1. *Quæſt.* 19. *Art.* 11.

309:04

Exceptions against a Writing of Mr. R. Baxters, in Answer to some Animadversions upon his Aphorisms.

HOw Relations should be *inter Entia & Nihil* I cannot see; For *Nihil* is *Non ens*; & *inter ens & non ens non datur medium.* Page 2. l. 2.

Εὐδοκία is indeed for most part so taken, as to include Love and Good-will; yet it seems to be otherwise taken *Matth.* 11. 26. and *Luke* 10. 21. as *Dr. Twisse* observeth. And it is true, Εὐδοκία & *Beneplacitum* express one the other: yet if we consider the propriety of the words, both of them may well signifie the Will and Pleasure of God concerning any thing whatsoever. It is observed, that the Lxx Interpreters devised the word Εὐδοκία to express the Hebrew *Ratsa*, which is as much as *Velle*; though it be often used for *Benevolum esse*. The Members of that distinction, [*Gratia gratum faciens, & Gratia gratis data*] fall one into another, as well as the Members of this, [*Voluntas Beneplaciti, & Voluntas Signi*] yet the distinction, though not so exact, may be useful. 4. *Vindic. Lib.* 1. *Part.* 2. *Sect.* 20.

1. What you intended, I know not; but you seem to speak alike of all the Signs mentioned, *Aphor.* p. 3. 2. I find *Aquinas* express for this, that *Voluntas Signi*, is but *Signum Voluntatis*; so that according to him *Voluntas Beneplaciti* seems indeed to signifie the whole Will of God, properly so called; and *Voluntas Signi* the whole Will of God also, so far forth as there is any signification of it. But however, I see not how you can hence infer, [then *impletio voluntatis beneplaciti de præsenti, non est signum voluntatis beneplaciti de jure*]. This seems but a meer evasion; it sufficeth, that *Imple-* *Ibid.* *Ibid.* 3. *Part* 1. *Quæst.* 19. *Art.* 11.

tio is *Signum Voluntatis de eventu*, as *Praeceptum* is *Signum Voluntatis de Officio*.

Ibid. 1. When you say, that God doth permit, and more than permit the Wicked to amend; I suppose you mean, he doth command them: But is not this to take the word [permit] morally? Yet *pag.* 5. you say, That you speak all the while of Permission Natural, not of Moral Permission. 2. Permission is only made *Signum Voluntatis Dei de malo*. Thus *Aquinas*, *Permissio ad malum refertur, operatio autem ad bonum*. And *Maccovius*, *Objectum Voluntatis Permissivæ Dei est peccatum. Ita quidem est. Nam bonum, quod vult, vult Voluntate effectivâ, non permissivâ*. 3. That *Permissio Mali*, is *certum signum voluntatis Dei de malo quod ad eventum*, I think is not to be denied. [*The Permissive Decree* (saith Bp *Davenant*) *concerning Sinful Actions, implyeth an infallibility of the Events so permitted*]. And he cites *Ruiz*, saying, *Positâ permissione, certissima est futuritio peccati, quod permittitur & omnium circumstantiarum, quæ permittuntur in illo*. So Dr. *Twisse*, *Posito decreto permittendi peccatum, non potuit homo à peccato abstinere: hæc tamen necessitas ex hypothesi cum libertate convenit*. *Camero* makes this the reason, why God doth foreknow evil, because he doth decree to permit it; which were no reason, if the Event did not certainly follow Permission. *Stat igitur sententia mea, Deus novit peccatum fore, quia decrevit permittere peccatum*. And he speaks divers times to this purpose. So *Maccovius*, *Deus præscit futura peccata. Ergo decrevit permittere. Nam quæ Deus præscit fore, ea præscit fore ex eo, quia decrevit*. The same Author also gives another reason; *Permissionem necessario sequitur eventus: hoc est, quod permittit Deus, necessario evenit.---Ratio etiam hoc ipsum evincit. Nam si Permissio nihil aliud est, quam gratiæ Dei subtractio, sive privatio, quâ posita peccatum impediretur, ut à nobis antè ostensum est, fieri non potest, ut Creatura non labatur ubi Deus eam non sustentat: in Deo enim Movemur, vivimus, & sumus*. And again; *Non agitur de Permissione Ethicâ, quæ nihil aliud est quàm Concessio, sed de Physicâ, hoc est, de non impedire. Quid verò sit disquiritur; Nos cum* Whitakero *dicimus, quòd sit privatio auxilii divini, quo posito peccatum impe-*

diretur.

Part 1. *Quæst.* 19. *Art.* 12. *Thes. Theolog. Disput.* 26.

Animad. p. 162.

Vindic. Lib. 1. *Part* 1. §. 3. §. 4. *Adversus Tilen.* pag. 193.

De Providente. Disp. 5. *Thes. Theolog.* part 1 *Disp.* 26.

Part 2. *Disp.* 14.

diretur.----*Necessariò ergò sequitur Permissionem Lapsus: interim tamen Permissio non est causa Lapsus, sed antecedens solùm.* 4. *Austins* saying, which I cited, seems to hold out thus much, That as well God's *Permittere* as his *Facere*, is a sure sign of his Will concerning the Event. 5. I see not, that the Opinion of the necessity of Physical Efficient Predetermination doth deny God's Permission, seeing that Predetermination is *de Bono*, or *de Actione quà tali*; but Permission is *de Malo*, or *de obliquitate Actionis*. Dr. *Twisse* in that very Digression which you mention, after a tedious Dispute against that Proposition, grants as much as (I think) *Perkins* did, or any need desire. For he grants, *Manifestò sequi peccati existentiam ex permissione ejus Divinâ*: He adds indeed, *Nequaquam sequitur ex naturâ Permissionis in genere, quod non paucis Theologis visum est, ut in superioribus accepimus, sed ex peculiari modo permissionis divinæ constante sc. negatione gratiæ, quippe sine quâ peccatum à nemine vitari potest.* But this is that Permission which Divines speak of, as I have shewed. What he further adds, *de peccato definitè sumpto*, viz. that a bare Permission doth not infer the existence of it, seems little to the purpose. To his Instance about Formation, I Answer: There is a Restraining Grace as well as a Renewing; God vouchsafes the one to many, to whom he doth not vouchsafe the other; see *Gen.* 20. 6. I grant, that besides a meer Permission, there must be (as he speaks) *aliqua alia rerum administratio, secundum quam actus alicujus naturalis patretur, quæ sit proxima materia talis deformitatis*: and that *quoties juxta Permissionem Divinam res aliqua sortitur effectum, toties Dei permissio non est solitaria, sed aliam Divinam Providentiæ gubernationem concomitantem obtinet.* But I suppose, that *Perkins* and others comprehend all under the name of Permission, that being it upon which Sin indefinitely considered, as *Twisse* himself confesseth, doth follow, though for the specification of the sin something more be required. The reason is, because *malum* is *privatio*, and so *in alieno fundo habitat*; therefore there cannot be *Permissio Mali*, but there must also be *Effectivus Concursus ad id, in quo Malum existit.* But for the thing it self *Twisse* is as clear (I think) as any. *Nec* (*inquit*) *minùs efficax esse*

Vindic. Lib. 2. Digr. 3. §. 3.

Vind. lib. 2 §. 2. §. 1.

esse dicimus decretum Dei de Permissione Mali, quam de Effectione Boni.

5. 1. I make *Voluntas Signi*, as put for *Signum Voluntatis*, to be but metaphorically *Voluntas*; yet I hold, that there is *Voluntas propriè dicta, quæ Signo indicatur.* 2. When I say [so far forth as the *Signum* is *præceptum*] it is only (as you might see) to shew, that *Voluntas Signi* (not *Signum Voluntatis*, but *voluntas cujus signum est Præceptum*) is the same with that which you call [Will of Precept]. 3. If *Dr. Twisse* do not extend it to the whole Law, but only to Precept, it may be he had not occasion to extend it further. Neither do you speak so fully in your *Aphorisms* as in this Writing. You mention indeed Legislative Will, but so as to call it also *Præceptive*, and to make the Object of it our Duty, *Aphor. pag.* 4. 4. That he doth take notice of the Immanent Will *de debito*, whereof *Præceptum* is *Signum*, is clear by the words which I cited, *viz. Præcepta non indicant quid Deus velit esse Nostri Officii*, &c. Yea your self here say, *p.* 4. That he makes *Præcipere & Vetare* to be the Objects of God's Will; and that this clearly implies, that he took in the Immanent Acts, of which they were the Objects. You add indeed, That he so often contradicteth it by speaking otherwise, that you doubt it fell from him *ex improviso*: but I see no cause for any such surmise.

6. 1. Those words of yours [*to bestow good upon a Man*]
3. 9. I know not how I omitted; perhaps because I thought there was no need of expressing them. For however they must be understood; because God's Word and Truth is else ingaged in a Threatning as well as in a Promise. 2. You say, *Append.* p. 48. *That the absolute promise of a New Heart is made to wicked Men*: where you seem to speak of a Promise properly taken, as distinct from Prophesie or Prediction: Yet *Aphor. p.* 9. you say, That *Absolute Promises are but meer Predictions*; so that you seem not well reconciled to your self. But you best know your own meaning, only I think it meet that you express it so, as that none may have occasion to stumble at it.

Ibid. I see indeed, that you call it *Legislative Will*: But,
4. *Ibid.* 1. you make Legislative and Preceptive both one, and make the Object of it Man's Duty, *Aphor. p.* 4. So that you

you rather ſeem to reſtrain the word [Legiſlative] by the word [Preceptive], than to enlarge the word [Preceptive] by the word [Legiſlative]. 2. When you take the word [Legiſlative] largely, you make Precept and Promiſe diſtinct parts of it: So that ſtill it is ſtrange to me that you ſhould ſay; *That Promiſes fall under the Will of Purpoſe, not of Precept.* For if the Will of Precept be taken ſtrictly and properly, it is ſuperfluous to ſay, That Promiſes do not fall under the Will of Precept: Neither on the other ſide is it true, if the Will of Precept be taken largely and improperly, *viz.* for the whole Legiſlative Will, which doth contain both Precept and Promiſe.

Theſe two Queſtions (as you now make them) you compriſe in one *Aphoriſm*, p. 15. and equally determine of both. For you ſay, *That the Life promiſed in the Firſt Covenant, was in the judgment of moſt Divines* (to whom you incline) *only the continuance of that Eſtate that* Adam *was in in Paradiſe:* So that according to this Opinion, *Adam* was both to have continued in the ſame place, and alſo in the ſame Eſtate. I think ſtill, he ſhould have been changed in reſpect of both. *In* Adamo (*inquit* Barlous) *omnes in univerſum homines jus ad Cœlum habebant, & ſi ipſe ſtetiſſet, ipſum Cœlum unuſquiſque habuiſſet; adeo ut jus ad Cœlum in* Adamo *habuimus primarum, à Chriſto jus reſtitutum.* *Adam*'s continuance in the ſame Eſtate, is moſt clearly expreſſed by thoſe whom you ſeem to follow; and how then can you ſay, That you did not meddle with that Queſtion? And if he were to continue in the ſame Eſtate, no queſtion he was alſo to continue in the ſame Place; For Heaven is no place for ſuch an Eſtate as *Adam* had in Paradiſe. *Ibid.* *Ibid.* 15. *Exercit.* 2.

7. I ſhall wonder if any will be ſo bold as to affirm, That *Adam* was Created *in Patriâ*, and not *in Viâ*. How was he to be tryed by his Obedience, if he were not *Viator*, but *Comprehenſor?* It ſeems alſo ſtrange that any doubt ſhould be made, whether *Adam* being Created after the Image and Likeneſs of God, were capable of Heavenly Bleſſedneſs.

Ibid. The Reaſons which I alleadged, notwithſtanding any thing you ſay againſt them, ſeem cogent. 1. By the Second Death, you might ſee, I meant not the ſame de-

gree, yet the ſame kind of puniſhment. The Scripture ſeems to ſpeak of ſeveral degrees of Hell-Torment, yet all is called the *Second Death*. And this Second Death, *viz.* Hell-Torment, *Adam* by his ſin became liable unto: therefore if he had not ſinned, he ſhould have enjoyed a Life directly oppoſite to that Death, *viz.* Cœleſtial Glory. The perpetual Death which *Adam* (without a Saviour) ſhould have ſuffered, was not a perpetual abiding in the Eſtate of Death, *viz.* a perpetual ſeparation of Soul and Body, or a meer privation of that Life he had before his Fall, but an enduring of eternal Torment; and ſo conſequently the Life promiſed upon condition of Obedience, was not a perpetuating of his earthly Life, but the fruition of Heavenly Happineſs. 2. I grant, God was able to change *Adam*'s State, not changing his Place; but it ſeems rather, that both ſhould have been changed. And though we know not the Nature of the Life to come, yet we know it is not ſuch a Life as *Adam* had in Paradiſe, to Eat, Drink, Marry, *&c.* 3. It is not in vain to ſay, How in an ordinary way of Providence ſhould there have been room for Men upon Earth, if *Adam* and his Poſterity, ſtill increaſing and multiplying *in infinitum*, ſhould there have continued for ever? Your Friend and mine Mr. *Blake*, having urged this Argument, ſeems to enervate it when he hath done, ſaying, [*But a thouſand of theſe God can expedite, when we are at a ſtand*]. But yet that without a Miracle it could be done, he doth not ſay, and he there profeſſedly oppoſeth you in this Point. Whereas you add, [*Eſpecially ſeeing God knew there would be no place for ſuch difficulties*] I know not to what purpoſe it is. For the Opinion, which I impugn, doth ſuppoſe that upon which ſuch difficulties do ariſe. 4. How ſhould Paradiſe be a Type of Heaven, if Man ſhould never have come to Heaven? If Heaven had not belonged unto him upon condition of his Obedience? Whereas you ſay, That *you little know where or what that Paradiſe was*; I do not well know what you mean. By [that Paradiſe] I ſuppoſe you underſtand (as I and others do) the Garden wherein *Adam* was placed: a place upon Earth for certain it was, and very pleaſant; yet ſuch a place as wherein *Adam* lived a natural Life, far beneath that happineſs which he was made capable of.

Of the Coven. *chap.* 5.

Thoſe

Those words [*Thou shalt die*] being not only meant of a privation of the Life which he then enjoyed, but also of eternal torment; it follows, That the Life implicitly promised, is to be understood, not only of the continuance of that Life, but of Eternal Blessedness. *Ibid.* 5. *Ibid.*

I do not say that any now are altogether as *Adam* was under the Covenant of Works; but that some are so under that Covenant, that *in statu quo* they have no part in the other Covenant, nor are guilty of contemning it, being utterly ignorant of it. *Ibid.*

To whom God doth not say, [*Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved*] to them in effect he doth say [*Obey perfectly and live*]; or, [*If thou sin, thou shalt die eternally*]. But there are many in the World to whom God doth not say [*Believe*, &c.] that Promise is altogether unknown unto them, they live and die without ever hearing of it, so that to them it is as if it had never been. Consider (I pray) what the Apostle saith to this purpose, *Ephes.* 2. 12. Might not the *Ephesians* have continued in that condition unto death? Do not many continue in the same Condition? I yeeld, that none are so under the Covenant of Works, but that if they repent and believe they shall have Mercy, and that by vertue of the New Covenant: but that which I stand upon is this, That the Covenant of Grace wherein Mercy is promised, being not revealed unto some, nor any way dispensed unto them, they cannot be said to be under it, nor shall be judged as transgressors of it. *Ibid.*

Add, 1. Though the Covenant of Grace had never been, yet I see not but such Mercies as the *Indians* enjoy, (setting aside the possibility of partaking of the New Covenant) might have been enjoyed. Add, 2. Though the Covenant of Works vouchsafeth no pardon of sin upon Repentance, yet surely it requiring perfect Obedience, consequently it also requireth Repentance and turning unto God. Else if the Covenant of Grace had not been made, Man after his Fall, though plunging himself into sin continually more and more, yet had contracted no more Guilt, nor incurred any greater Condemnation, than he did by his first Transgression. Add, 3. Christ as Mediator shall judge even those that never heard of any Salvation to be obtained by him; and consequently he will not judge them as guilty of neglecting that Salvation. 8.

Christ

Christ judgeth wicked Men as Rebellious Subjects; but as rebelling (I conceive) only against the Law, not against the Gospel, they being such as never were acquainted with it. Add, 4. There are common Mercies, (which might have been though the New-Covenant had not been) the abuse whereof is sufficient to condemn; yet the improvement of them is not sufficient to save. If such Mercies as meer *Pagans* enjoy tend to their recovery, How then are such said to be ἀπῃδὲ μὴ ἐχοντες? *Ephes.* 2. 12.

Ibid. *Rom.* 2. 12. I cited to this purpose, to shew, That as they that sinned without the Law, shall perish without the Law; even so they that sinned without the Gospel, shall perish without the Gospel. That 2 *Thess.* 1. 7, 8. speaks not only of them that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, but also of such as know not God. The Apostle there seemeth to divide all the Wicked into two sorts, *viz.* such as know not God; so he describes the Gentiles, 1 *Thess.* 4. 5. and such as obey not the Gospel, *&c.* that is, such as having had the Gospel preached unto them, would not receive it, either not at all, or not sincerely. Yet Christ (he saith) will in flaming fire take vengeance on both, as well on the former as on the latter. And here also I have Mr. *Blake* agreeing with me, and so, as that he citeth this very place to the same purpose as I do. *Infidels* (saith he) *that were never under any other Covenant than that of works, and Covenant-breaking Christians, are in the same condemnation; there are not two Hells, but one and the same for those that know not God, and those that obey not the Gospel of Christ,* 2 Thess. 1. 8.]

Of the Coven. *Chap.* 5. *p.* 23.

Ibid. You pass by that which I alledged from *Rom.* 6. *ult.* *viz.* That death, which is the wages of sin, is opposed to Eternal Life, which is the happiness of the Saints in Heaven. *Ergo*, Death comprehends in it the misery of the Damned in Hell; and that (you know) is it which the Scripture calls the *Second Death.* I marvel therefore that you make no more of it than to say, [*Call it the first or second Death, as you please*]?

Ibid. The Argument drawn from the Bodies Co-partnership with the Soul, I take to be a good proof of its Resurrection. *Tertullian* surely thought so, or else he would not so frequently have used this Argument. *Age* (*inquit*) *scindant adversarii nostri carnis animæque contextum*

De Resur. *cap.* 15.

textum prius in vitæ administratione, ut ita audeant scindere illud etiam in vitæ remuneratione. Negent operum societatem, ut merito possint etiam mercedem negare. Non sit particeps in sententia caro, si non fuerit in causâ. And again, *Secundum consortia laborum consortia etiam decurrant necesse est præmiorum.* And again also, *Non possunt separari in mercede (caro & anima) quas opera conjungit.* And surely that of the Apostle, 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. [*That every Man may receive the things done in the Body*] doth imply, That as the things were done in the Body, so also the Reward must be received in the Body. As for the dissolution of the Body which you speak of, it is but such a punishment as the Godly lie under as well as the Wicked, until the Resurrection. Therefore it is not probable, that it was the only punishment intended to the Body in the First Covenant. What-ever some new Philosophers may say, true Philosophy (I think) doth tell us, That it is the Body, which by the Sensitive Soul doth feel pain; even as it is the Eye, which doth see by the Visive Faculty. *Ibid.* c. 38. *Ibid.* c. 8.

You observe not (it seems) that I did but answer your *Queries*, which you made *Append.* p. 10. To the second, [*When should he have risen?*] I thought, and still think it sufficient to answer, That *Adam*, and so others, should either have risen in the end of the World, as now they shall, or when God should please to raise them. It is for you to prove that it could be neither the one way nor the other. *Ibid.*

How doth the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 15. seem to extend the Resurrection, which he speaks of, unto all, when he expressly limits it to those that are Christs? *vers.* 23. And when the whole discourse is about Resurrection unto Glory? *Expressè resurrectio Christi est causa resurrectionis eorum, qui ad Vitam Æternam suscitabuntur,* 1 Cor. 15. 20, 21, 22. To the same purpose also is that 1 *Thess.* 4. 14, &c. What the other Texts you speak of be, when you shew, I may consider then. This I grant, That the Wicked shall rise by the Power of Christ as Mediator, *John* 5. 28, 29. But that is not enough to prove, That had not Christ been Mediator, there should have been no Resurrection; no more than it follows, that otherwise none should have been condemned for sin, because now all 9. Maccov. *de stat. primi ho.* Disc. 5.

all Judgment is committed unto Christ, *John* 5. 22, 27.

Ibid. I see no such difference betwixt them. For slaying before the foundation of the World, cannot be meant of
7. 24. actual slaying, but only of fore-ordaining to be slain.

Ibid. I mean Christ's Sufferings, as in obedience to his Father he submitted unto them. *This Commandment have I received of my Father*, said he, *John* 10. 18. Sufferings simply considered without Obedience, find no acceptance with God. No need therefore to except against the Phrase commonly used, [*Passive Obedience*] *i. e.* Obedience in Suffering. Christ had a Commandment to lay down his Life, it was the Will of his Father that he should do it, and in obedience thereto he did it.

Vide Gataker *cont.* Gomarum *p.* 14, 15. *Ibid.* *Ibid.* 56. The Rule (*A quatenus ad omne*, &c.) doth not here make for you, because it was not Christ's suffering meerly as obedience, but as such obedience, *viz.* Obedience in suffering, that was satisfactory. So that neither Suffering without Obedience, nor Obedience without Suffering would avail. *Sed quæ non prosunt singula, juncta juvant.*

Ibid. If only such Obedience be meant *Rom.* 5. 19. as is opposed to *Adam*'s disobedience, and therefore Active Obedience is meant, it will follow that only Active Obedience is meant, which you will not admit, because *Adam*'s Disobedience was only Active. But Christ's Obedience in Suffering, may be opposed to *Adam*'s Disobedience in Acting; and Christ's Passive Obedience (suffer me to speak so) may stand in opposition to Disobedience in general, as working a contrary effect, *viz.* Whereas Disobedience doth make Sinful, Christ's (Passive) Obedience doth make Righteous; and in that respect only doth the Apostle oppose Christ's Obedience to *Adam*'s Disobedience.

10. 1. The Apostle saying, That *Christ was made under*
Ibid. *the Law*, it seems to be without doubt, That it was the
58. Will of God that he should observe the Law. For is it not the Will of God that his Law should be observed by such as are under it? Yet Christ might observe the Law for some ends peculiar to himself, as for those ends he was made under it. Christ according to the flesh was a Jew, therefore meet it was he should observe the Jewish Law, otherwise he had been an offence unto them.

2. As

2. As Christ was not made Man for himself, so (it is true) he was not bound to observe the Law for himself. But thus you should not limit it to some Works; for all his Works were so for us, as he was *nobis natus, nobis datus*, Isa. 9. 6. Yet being made Man, as Man he was bound (I think) to perform that Obedience which God did require of Man. You say, That he used the Legal Ceremonies to shew his subjection: So say I; and this (I think) is against you, it being meant of such subjection as the Law required of all those that were under it. 3. If Christ were *sub Lege*, as the Apostle saith he was, then it was *ex Lege* that he observed those legal rites. Yet, I grant, it was *ex vi sponsionis propriæ*; so all that he did, so his very being made Man was. Whereas you say, [*Else the Law would have obliged him to the act and end together*]; I Answer, The Law doth oblige, according to the Will of the Law-giver, who might oblige Christ to it otherwise than he did others. I think the Ceremonial Observances, besides the Typical Nature of them, are to be considered as Religious Rites, whereby God was honoured and worshipped; and so Christ as Man was obliged unto them, Man being bound to honour and worship God, so as God doth require of him. That which you add of the burthen of Penal Actions, seems impertinent; For Penal Actions (I think) have the nature of Sufferings, and so they concern not the Point in Controversie betwixt us, which is only concerning Actions as Pious, not as Penal.

Your Reasons drawn from the Actions of Christ, receiving their chief Dignity from his chief Nature, &c. will reach further (I think) than you intend or desire, even to make all Christ's Active Righteousness to be satisfactory for us. And so indeed you seem to hold, *Aph.* p. 61. where you say, [*The Interest of the Divine Nature in all the Works of Christ, maketh them to be infinitely meritorious and satisfactory*]. Yet here, p. 10. you seem to restrain it to Penal Actions, and the burthen of tedious Ceremonious Worship, as you call it. For my part, I yet think, That as the Holiness of Christ's Nature, so also the Holiness of his Life was requisite to qualifie him for suffering, and (by suffering) satisfying for us. *Him that knew no sin, God made sin for us*, 2 Cor. 5. *ult. Such an High-Priest became us, who is holy,* *Ibid.* 11. 9. 59.

holy, harmleſs, &c. Heb. 7. 26. Mr. *Blake* (whoſe Judgment I do much value, though I cannot force mine own further than I am convinced) in this Point, concerning the Imputation of Chriſt's Active Righteouſneſs, ſeems to differ both from you and me; he ſaith, [*Chriſt had been innocent, though he had never come under the Law to have yeelded that obedience*]. But how Chriſt could have continued innocent, without yeelding obedience to the Law; or how being Man, he could be exempt from that Law, whereby the Creature is to ſhew his ſubjection to the Creator, I cannot ſee. He adds, [*His Perſon had not been as ours under the Law, unleſs of his own accord he had been made under the Law*]. He was not made Man (ſay I) but of his own accord; yet being Man, I conceive it was neceſſary that he ſhould be under that Law which God impoſed upon Man, and ſo both under the Moral Law, as the eternal Rule of Righteouſneſs; and alſo under the Ceremonial Law, as the preſcribed Rule of Worſhip. He adds further, [*Somewhat might be ſaid for the ſubjection of the Humane Nature in Chriſt, the Manhood of Chriſt, which was a Creature, but the Perſon of Chriſt, God-Man, ſeems to be above ſubjection*]. This I confeſs ſeems ſtrange to me; for the Humane Nature of Chriſt, though perſonally united to the Divine Nature, being ſtill a Creature, muſt needs be in ſubjection to him that made it; and therefore the Perſon of Chriſt, God-Man, though not as God, but as Man, muſt be under ſubjection. He goes on ſaying, [*We know the mortality of the Humane Nature, yet Chriſt had never died, unleſs he had made himſelf obedient unto death; neither needed to have ſerved, unleſs he had humbled himſelf*, Phil. 2. *to take upon him the form of a Servant*]. But Mortality is no neceſſary conſequent of Humane Nature, as ſubjection unto God is; and Chriſt taking upon him the Nature of Man, did *eo nomine* take upon him the form of a Servant; for Man muſt be Servant unto God, the Creature to the Creator. He bids, [See the *Aſſemblies Confeſſion of Faith*, Chap. 8. Sect. 5. and Dr. *Featlies* Speeches upon it]. Theſe Speeches I cannot now ſee, but I have ſeen them long ago, and was not ſatisfied with them. The words of the Aſſembly are ſuch, as that ſome queſtion may be made of the meaning of them, *viz.* Whether by [Chriſt's

Of the Coven. *c. 12. p. 78.*

Vide Gataker*um noſtrum adverſus Lucium, Reſponſ. ad vindic.* Part. 2. Sect. 7. pag. 54 *&c Et contra* Gomarum *p. 4 & 22.*

[Christ's perfect Obedience and Sacrifice of himself] be not meant one and the same thing, so that the latter words are exegetical to the former. But to return to you, who say, [*The Question should be, Whether it be only* Pœna Christi, *or* Obedientia *also, that satisfieth and meriteth*]? I think it is not simply *Pœna*, or *Obedientia*, but *Pœna Obedientialis*, and *Obedientia Panalis*.

1. The Creator is absolute Lord over the Creature, and so you grant no Work of the Creature can be meritorious. 2. You seem to make even the Actions of sinful men capable of being meritorious, though less properly. 3. Though Obedience be absolutely perfect, yet if absolutely due, it seems repugnant to *Luke* 17. 10. that it should be meritorious. 11. *Ibid.* 60.

The interest of the Divine Nature doth certainly put an infinite excellency into all Christ's Actions: Yet I see not how Christ's good Actions (I speak of meer Actions, which have no penality or suffering mixed with them) could properly be meritorious, they being otherwise due, supposing Man had not sinned, and so there had needed no satisfaction to be made for him. Though I am not of their mind, who think that the Son of God should have been incarnate, though Man had never sinned; yet I see no reason to doubt but so it might have been: Now *hoc supposito*, all Christ's meer Active Righteousness would have been due, but not his Passive Righteousness. *Ibid.* *Ibid.* 61.

I have divers times told you, That when we speak of Christ's Sufferings as meritorious or satisfactory, we are not to consider them meerly as Penal, but as Obediential also; so that your long Section hath nothing against me. 12.

My interpretation of these words, [*The Father judgeth no Man*] containeth indeed no absolute exclusion of the Father, neither can I admit any such exclusion; but an exclusion of him in some respect it doth contain. He that doth a thing, yet not immediately by himself, but by another whom he hath put in authority to do it, may be said in some respect not to do it. When the Egyptians cried to *Pharaoh* for Bread, he had them go to *Joseph*, &c. *Gen.* 41. 55. *q. d.* I meddle not with these things, *Joseph* is to do all such matters. Yet *Pharaoh* indeed did all, though not immediately, but by *Joseph*. Your Arguments, *p.* 13. press not me, who never intended to deny that it belongs to Christ's Mediatorship, *Ibid.* 10. 65.

ſhip, and namely to his Kingly Office, to judge the World; only I ſhewed what I took to be the meaning of thoſe Texts, *John* 5. 22. & 27. Wherein I followed *Janſenius* and *Maldonate*, no abſurd Expoſitors, though Papiſts. And even *Calvin* and *Beza* alſo ſeem to agree with me in the excluſion of the Father, *v.* 22. *In Patre*

Calv. in John 5. 22. Beza in eundem loc.

nihil mutatum eſt, &c. *Eſt enim ipſe in Filio, & in eo operatur*, ſaith *Calvin*. And ſo *Beza*, *Negat Chriſtus à Patre adminiſtrari hunc mundum, ita, viz. ut* Judæi *arbitrabantur; qui Patrem à Filio ſeparabant, cum Pater contrà non niſi in perſonâ Filii manifeſtati in carne mundum regat.*

14. Ibid. 67.

You ſeem to make the preſent death of *Adam* a part of the rigorous execution of the Law, when you ſay, *Aphor.* p. 33. [*That the Sentence ſhould have been immediately executed to the full, or that any ſuch thing is concluded in the words of the Threat*, In the day that thou eateſt, &c. *I do not think; for that would have prevented both the Being, the Sin, and the Suffering of his Poſterity*]. How would this have been prevented, if *Adam*'s preſent Death were not included in the immediate and full execution of the Sentence, *i. e.* in the rigorous execution of it? Therefore though you argue, That the words of the Threat were not ſo meant, as that the Sentence ſhould immediately be executed to the full, yet your very Argument ſuppoſeth, That if the Sentence ſhould have been ſo executed, *Adam* ſhould preſently have died. Now though Chriſt had not died, yet this part of the rigorous execution of the Law might have been ſuſpended, and ſuppoſing the propagation of Mankind muſt have been: againſt this (ſo far as I ſee) you ſay nothing.

Ibid. 11. 68.

I deſire to be as favourable an Animadverter as Truth will permit: but how under the name of Animadverſion I defend what you ſay, I do not ſee. If you had uſed the word [*Chaſtiſements*], it would not have freed you from mine Animadverſion. For I ſhew that Chaſtiſements are Puniſhments. And whereas you ſpeak of my great overſight, it is indeed your great miſtake; for I did not take thoſe words to expreſs your Opinion, only you ſeemed therein to allow the diſtinction betwixt Afflictions of Love and Puniſhments; this is it which I thought worthy of an Animadverſion.

You

You might see, that I make the Afflictions of God's Children in their Nature to be Evil, and a Curse, though not so to them, they being sanctified and working for their good. And I presume, those Divines whom you oppose, meant as both you and I do, though you interpret them otherwise. The difference here betwixt you and me is this; You allow their Expression, and dislike their meaning; I allow their Meaning, and dislike their Expression. They distinguish betwixt Chastisements and Punishments, which distinction in your *Aphorisms* you seem to allow, only disliking the Application of it. The distinction it self I dislike, though I think that some who used it, did not err in that which they intended in it. In the Contents of *Isa.* 27. there are these words, [*God's Chastisements differ from Judgments*], which words I hold incongruous. I like not that of Mr. *Kendal* against Mr. *Goodwin*, Chap. 4. p. 139. [*Punishment aimeth chiefly at the satisfaction of Justice, Correction at the amendment of the Offender*]. That is not true of all Punishments, see *Geld.* Lib. 6. cap. 14. Yet the meaning of those that used them, was not (I think) erroneous. 15.

I would give you no cause to quarrel with me. But is not this your own Argument? Do you not thus oppose the *Common Judgment* as you call it? [*They are ascribed to God's anger*, &c.] *Aphor. p.* 70. Do you not there oppose God's Anger to his Love? Whereas Love and Hatred, not Love and Anger are truly opposite, God may be angry with us, and yet love us; yea therefore angry with us, because he loveth us. *Rev.* 3. 20. There is *Ira Paterna & Castigans*, as well as *Ira Hostilis & Exterminans*, Davenant in *Col.* 3. 6. Where those words of yours are, which you say I almost repeat, I do not know. I expressed my own sence in mine own words; and my scope was only to correct that Opposition which you make betwixt Love and Anger, though I see that *Aphor.* p. 71. You speak of a mixture of Love and Anger, and say, *That there is no Hatred, though there be Anger.* My chief design in those Animadversions was, That you might in your Second Edition, which you promised, one might have occasion, if not to confirm your Assertion, yet to clear your Expressions. *Ibid.* 12. 70.

I know you oppose their sence that so distinguish, but their distinction simply considered you seem to admit; *Ibid.*

if you ſay that you do not, I am ſatisfied.

Ibid. Your words were of Affliction as Affliction, therefore
Ib. Ib. of Affliction in general. You ſay, *Aphor.* p. 70. [*The very nature of Affliction is to be a loving puniſhment*, &c.] But you confeſs now, that you ſhould have ſaid [*Chaſtiſement*]; and ſo I have my deſire in this Particular, *viz.* your better expreſſion.

Ibid. God is not the Father of the Unregenerate, though Elect,
Ib. Ib. in reſpect of Actual Adoption: But you know that *Epheſ.* 1. 5. [*Having predeſtinated us to the Adoption of Sons*, &c.] God having loved ſuch with an everlaſting Love, *viz. Benevolentiæ*, though not *Complacentiæ*, no marvel if he afflict them in Love before their Converſion, *viz.* in order to their Converſion. But (you know) I ſpeak of Reprobates, and that it is written, [Jacob
Rom. 9. 13. *have I loved, but* Eſau *have I hated*]; Whether that import the Election of *Jacob*, and the Reprobation of *Eſau*, I now diſpute not; but I think it doth import God's love of the *Elect*, and his hatred of the Reprobate. *Deus omnes homines diligit* (*inquit* Aquinas) *&*
Part 1. Queſt. 23. Art. 3. ad 1. *etiam omnes Creaturas, in quantum omnibus vult aliquod bonum: non tamen quodcunque bonum vult omnibus. In quantum igitur non vult hoc bonum quod eſt vita æterna, dicitur eos odio habere, & reprobare.*

Ibid. Sanctified Suffering I hold to be *malum in ſe & ſuâ*
Ib. Ib. *naturâ*; and ſo I think do they, againſt whom you diſpute in your *Aphoriſms*: but though Suffering as Suffering be evil, yet as Sanctified it is not evil. *It is good for me that I was afflicted*, Pſal. 119. 71.

16. Afflictions were then indeed to be loved, if they were good of their own Nature: but being only good as ſanctified, we are not ſimply to deſire them, but a ſanctified uſe of them, and in that reſpect to rejoice in them, *Jam.* 1. 2, 3. *Rom.* 5. 3, 4, 5. Whereas you adviſe me to take heed of arguing thus, [*That which worketh for our good*, &c.] Where do I argue ſo? Rather thus; That which is ſanctified to us, doth work for our good: and ſo though it be evil in it ſelf, yet it is good to us. But Affliction is ſanctified, *&c.*

Ibid. I am apt to overſee: but neither I, nor they (I think)
Ib. Ib. whom you firſt oppoſed, deny Sin to be the meritorious cauſe of Affliction, if that were all you aimed at in your Queſtion.

What

What I mean by Conformity unto Christ, you might see by *Rom.* 8. 17. which I cited: I may also add 1 *Pet.* 4. 17. In these places the Scripture speaks of suffering for well-doing, which is acceptable with God, 1 *Pet.* 2. 19. Yet I grant, sin is the Root of all suffering; so it was of Christ's suffering, though not his sin, but ours. Only I thought it meet to put you in mind, that God in sending Affliction hath other ends than to punish sin, which the places alledged do shew, and so other places. *Ibid.*

The Object of Love is not only present Good. There is a Love of Desire, as well as of Delight. The Spouse wanting Christ, was sick of Love, *Cant.* 5. 8. *Ibid.* 13. 71.

I did not say, That Sanctified Suffering is not Evil, but that it is not evil as sanctified. Suffering, though sanctified, is suffering still, and so evil; but as sanctified, it is good, and not evil. *Ibid.*

Those Arguments prove nothing against me, nor (I am perswaded) against those Divines mentioned in your *Aphorisms.* It is granted, That Death in it self is Evil, an Enemy, a Punishment, to be feared, avoided, &c. Yet as it is sanctified, it is good, a Friend, a Mercy, to be desired, embraced, &c. 2 *Cor.* 5. 6, 7, 8. *Phil.* 1. 21, 23. 17. *Ib.* &

It is evil, 1. to them to whom it is not managed for their good. 2. To them also to whom it is so managed, but not as it is so managed. *Ibid.* *Ib.* 72.

Lex abrogata vim nullam habet obligandi, saith *Grotius.* Well, but we are not always so much to mind the strict propriety of words, as what they that use them do mean by them. *Ibid.* 14. 79. *De Satisfact.* p. 57.

That which you speak of our discharge before believing, might have been omitted, the question being about Believers, and so believing presupposed. *Ibid.*

Why the Justification and Condemnation of Believers doth not depend upon the Law, this (I think) is a sufficient reason, *Christ hath redeemed them from the Curse of the Law*, &c. *Gal.* 3. 13. *Si quid novisti rectius isto, Candidus imperti.* 18. 15. 83.

The Law so concurs to the constitution of Guilt, as were there no Law, there were no Transgression. In the other two Particulars, which follow, we do accord also. *Ibid.* *Ib.* *Ib.*

Ibid. 16. 85. 1. Neither did I mean ſo, as if there were no explicit threatning to Unbelievers, but only this, That pardon of all ſin being promiſed upon condition of believing, it implies that death is only threatned in caſe of unbelief. And tho there be an expreſs threatning to Unbelievers, (*viz. Mark* 16. 16.) yet not only to Unbelievers. The threatning of death only to Unbelievers, is (I think) only implyed in the promiſe of Life made to Believers. 2. Neither did my words hold out any other meaning of 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 7, 8. than what you expreſs. 3. The new Law or Goſpel requiring Faith, the Fruit whereof is Obedience; it will condemn the diſobedient, *i. e.* it will leave them to the condemnation of the Law, while they remain in that eſtate, though it hold out Mercy upon condition, that they believe and bring forth Fruit meet for repentance.

Ibid. 17. 86. Mr. *Lawſon* I know for an able Scholar; but his reaſons for that Poſition I do not know. If no Law, no ſin; for *ſin is a tranſgreſſion of the Law*, 1 John 3. 4.

19. *Ib.* 89. Your ſaying, *Aphor.* p. 89. [*Whoſoever will believe to the end, ſhall be juſtified*], may ſeem to imply, That though a Man believe, yet he remains unjuſtified, (as well as unglorified) until he go on and hold out unto the end: otherwiſe (I ſuppoſe) all will yeeld, That a Man muſt believe unto the end, that he may be juſtified unto the end.

Ibid. 18. *Ib.* 1. Though you deny that which I ſay your words ſeem to imply; yet what your meaning was, or is, you do not clearly ſhew. 2. You ſeemed to make the Life promiſed to *Adam*, only a continuance of his preſent enjoyments, which were as all upon the Earth, ſo many of them earthly, and none comparable to the happineſs of the Saints in Heaven.

Ibid. *Ib. Ib.* 1. Though there be ſeveral degrees of Damnation, yet all being the damnation of Hell, I do not think that there is ſuch difference between one degree of Damnation and another, as there is betwixt the ſcratch of a Pin, and the pulling off a Man's fleſh with Pincers. 2. If *Adam* had not ſinned, he ſhould have had that happineſs which all thoſe Priviledges that you mention tend unto; and by his ſin he forfeited all that happineſs. Beſides, when I ſpake of the identity of Puniſhment for kind, though not for degree, I meant it of *Pœna ſenſus*; add that

that (I conceived) was your meaning also.

No question but the Confirmation, Radication, and further degree of Grace is comprehended in those Promises, [*I will put my Law in their inward parts*, &c.] as a further degree of Spiritual Circumcision is promised, *Deut.* 30 6. and a greater measure of the Spirit, *Luk.* 11. 13. But though the Circumstances of these Texts do so limit the Promises contained in them, (which yet may be questioned concerning *Deut.* 30. 6.) yet so do not (that I see) the Circumstances of that in *Jer.* 31. 33. and *Heb.* 8. 10. And therefore there is no reason to restrain these in that manner. *Ampliandi favores.* Besides, it is certain, Man can perform no condition required of him, except God work it in him, 2 *Cor.* 3. 5. *Phil.* 2. 13. *Ibid.* *Ib.* 91.

By Relative Change you mean Justification and Adoption: Now I think it is no hard matter to prove a real change in any, in whom this relative change is, *i. e.* That they that are justified and adopted, are also sanctified. 1. They that are justified and adopted, are Christs, *Gal.* 3. ult. *Ergo*, they that are justified and adopted, are sanctified. For so are they that are Christs, *Rom.* 8. 9. Take the Syllogism, if you please, thus; They that are * Christs, are sanctified: But they that are justified and adopted, are Christs. Therefore they that are justified and adopted, are sanctified. 2. They that are in a state of Salvation, are sanctified, 2 *Thess.* 2. 13. *John* 3. 3, 5. But they that are justified and adopted, are in a state of Salvation, *Tit.* 3. 7. *Rom.* 8. 17. *Ergo.* Hear one, with whom you are acquainted, and whom I shall have occasion to cite afterward, *viz.* Wotton, *Ut regni* (*inquit*) *cœlestis hereditatem adipiscamur, & venia peccatorum, & sanctimonia opus est, — Quâ enim ratione heres esse vitæ æternæ intelligatur, qui immundus est?* And lest you should put this off, and say, That Sanctification indeed is requisite before any can enter into the possession of Eternal Life; but not before they can have a right unto it; he adds, *Remissione igitur sive condonatione opus est ad hæreditatis jus obtinendum: Sed nequaquam in illâ sunt omnia. Etenim* (*ut paulò antè significavi*) *accedat etiam oportet regeneratio, per quam sanctimoniâ imbuamur. Quare Christus factus est nobis & justitia, & sanctificatio;* 1 Cor. 1. 30. For the Arguments which you mention in Mr. *Bedford*'s Book, if you had propoun- *Ibid.* 19. 95. * *Viz.* By actual relation unto him. *De Reconcil.* Part 2. Lib. 2. Cap. 22.

ded any of them, I ſhould have conſidered how to anſwer them. Now as you only refer me to that Book for Arguments againſt my Opinion, ſo ſhall I refer you to another Book for anſwer to thoſe Arguments, *viz.* Mr. *Gataker*'s lately publiſhed,

20. Nay indeed, if Baptiſm be a Seal of remiſſion of ſins, then remiſſion of ſins (I think) is not the end of Baptiſm. For the thing muſt be, before it be ſealed, *i. e.* confirmed. Though Baptiſm therefore be ordained to this end, to ſeal remiſſion of ſins, yet none can make this uſe of it, until they believe, and ſo have their ſins remitted. Neither doth this make for *Anabaptiſts*, for Circumciſion was of the ſame nature, *Rom.* 4. 11. Yet were Infants circumciſed. [*Not all that are baptized* (ſaith Bp. *Downam*) *are truly juſtified*]. And again, [*It is not neceſſary, that every one baptized, ſhould preſently be regenerated, or juſtified: but Baptiſm is a Seal to him of the Righteouſneſs of Faith, either to be applied by the Holy Ghoſt to the Elect dying in infancy, or to be apprehended alſo by Faith in them, who living to years of diſcretion, have grace to believe*]. Again alſo, [*The* Papiſts *themſelves teach, That the Sacraments do not confer Grace* ponenti obicem mortalis peccati; *but all that come to Baptiſm, are guilty* (*if not juſtified before*) *of mortal ſin, not only* adulti; *who to their original ſin have added their own perſonal tranſgreſſion, but Infants alſo, who beſides their original corruption, in reſpect whereof they are mortally dead in ſin, ſtand guilty of* Adam's *moſt heinous tranſgreſſion*]. 2. Baptiſm is as well a Seal of Sanctification, as of Remiſſion of Sins; for it ſeals the whole Covenant, and all the Promiſes contained in it. And as Circumciſion ſignified and ſealed the taking away of the Foreskin (or ſuperfluity of naughtineſs, as St. *James* ſpeaketh, *Chap.* 1. 21.) of the Heart, ſo doth Baptiſm ſignifie & ſeal the waſhing away of the filthineſs, as well as of the guiltineſs of it. Indeed Mr. *Mede* in one of his *Diatribæ*, would have the thing ſignified in Baptiſm, to be only the ſanctifying Grace of the Holy Ghoſt; wherein I cannot ſubſcribe unto him. Whereas you ſpeak of an External Covenant, as ſome call it; ſome may expreſs themſelves one way, ſome another, yet all mean the ſame thing. For my part, I do not uſe to ſpeak of an External Covenant, but of an

Of Perſeverance. *ch.* 12.

Exter-

External Being in the Covenant, which is all that ordinarily we can be assured of in respect of others, and which is enough for admittance to the Sign and Seal of the Covenant. The People of the Jews, until by professed unbelief they fell away, were generally in the Covenant, *Rom.* 9. 4. even in that Covenant, which they that were Aliens from, had no hope, *Ephes.* 2. 12. Yet many of them were but externally in the Covenant, *Rom.* 9. 6,27, 29. You labour in vain, when you seek to evade that Text, *Rom.*8. 9. How should any be actually Christs, except they be united to him? And how united, but by the Spirit? 1 *Cor.* 6. 17. And if you meant (as you say) only of Saving Relations, Can a Saving Relation be put upon any, and yet no Saving Work wrought in them? Neither truly is a meer profession such a real change, as I supposed you did mean, *viz.* a change of the Heart, whereby one is made a new Creature.

I think that properly there are not distinct Laws, from whose distinct condemnations we must be freed: That the Gospel doth not condemn any, but only leave some to the Law to be condemned by it, though their Condemnation by reason of the Gospel, as of every Mercy neglected, or abused, will be the greater. 23. *Ibid.* 103. *Ad.* 1.

The Father (as I have said before) doth judg, though by Christ, see *Acts* 17. 31. And however, I see not how you can conclude any thing to the purpose by this Argument. *Ibid.* *Ad.* 2.

If for every several Accusation there must be a several Righteousness, then there will be need of infinite Righteousnesses, seeing there may be infinite accusations. But one Righteousness, *viz.* that of Christ's Satisfaction for us, will take off all Accusations brought against us; else how doth the Apostle say, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge*, &c. *Rom.*8. 33,34. Indeed the Promise is made upon condition of believing, and therefore the not performing of the Condition, debars from benefit of the Promise. But this (I conceive) is not properly a new Accusation, but only a making good of the former accusation, we having nothing to shew why it should not stand in force against us. Your self did well distinguish *p.* 22. betwixt a Condition as a Condition, and a Condition as a Duty. Now Faith as a Condition, is required in the Gospel, but as a Duty in the Law; For the Law requires 24. *Ad.* 3.

us in all things to obey God; that is comprehended in the first Precept, therefore it requires us to believe in Christ, God commanding it. Else not to believe, were no sin; *for sin is a transgression of the Law*, 1 Joh. 3. 4. Now as Believing is a Duty, so not-believing doth afford matter of Accusation, and cause of Condemnation: But as Believing is a Condition, so Not-believing doth only leave the Accusation otherwise made in force against us; and for sin, whereof we are accused and found guilty, leaves us to condemnation. Thus (I think) are those Texts to be understood, *John* 3. 18. and *ult.* Whereas you say, That *the Accusation may be three-fold*, truly in that manner it may be manifold: But indeed the Accusation is but one and the same, *viz.* that we are *Non-credentes*: For *Pagans* do not so much as appear, and *Hypocrites*, are *no* and * *Solifidians* do but appear to be Believers.

* Solifidians

Believers,

as believing is a receiving of Christ, and that is the believing by which we are justified.

Ibid. Ad. 4. For the several Sentences from whence you argue; 1. You urged *Joh.* 5. 22. to prove that God Creator judgeth none. 2. How are any freed from the Sentence of the first Law, but by the benefit of the New Law? therefore I see no ground for that which you seem to insinuate, *viz.* That we must first be freed from the Sentence of one Law, and then of another. Indeed I do not see, That the Gospel hath any Sentence of Condemnation distinct from the Law; only it doth condemn Unbelievers, in that it doth not free them from that condemnation which by the Law is due unto them.

Ibid. Ad. 5. That there is a sorer punishment, as of a distinct kind, than that Death threatned *Gen.* 3. you do not prove, neither (I presume) can it be proved. There are (I grant) several degrees of that Death, yet all of the same kind, *viz.* The loss of Heavenly Happiness, and the enduring of Hell-Torment. And if there must be a several Righteousness for every several degree of Punishment, there must be more Righteousnesses than you either do or can assign.

Ibid. Ad. 6. I say as before, I do not think this, [*Thou art an Unbeliever*] (I speak of Unbelief as a not-performing of the Gospel-Condition) to be a new Accusation, but only a Pla-

Plea why the former ſhould ſtand good, *viz.* that we are ſinners, and ſo to be condemned by the Law, becauſe the benefit of the Goſpel which we lay claim to, doth not belong unto us, we not performing the condition to that end required of us.

Whereas you ſay, [*We are devolved to the New Law before our Juſtification is compleat*]. Are we not devolved to it for the very beginning of our Juſtification? So again, [*Chriſt's Satisfaction is imputed to us for Righteouſneſs*, &c. *But the New Covenant gives the perſonal Intereſt*]. Doth not the New Covenant give Chriſt alſo, in whom we have intereſt? I note theſe Paſſages, becauſe your meaning in them perhaps is ſuch as I do not ſufficiently underſtand. *Ibid.*

I ſay ſtill, Here is no occaſion properly of a new Accuſation, but only of a *removens prohibens*, a taking away of that which would hinder the force of the former Accuſation. And ſo there is no new Righteouſneſs of ours required unto Juſtification, but only a Condition, without which we cannot have intereſt in Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, that thereby we may be juſtified. *Ibid.*

In your *Aphoriſms* you ſpeak only of a Two-fold Righteouſneſs requiſite unto Juſtification; now you ſpeak of a Two-fold Juſtification neceſſary to be attained. But the Scripture ſpeaks of Juſtification by Chriſt, and Juſtification by Faith, as of one and the ſame Juſtification, *Acts* 13. 39. *Rom.* 5. 1. *Ibid.*

The Second Cauſe, (as you call it) *viz.* [*Whether the Defendant have performed the condition of the New Covenant*] is indeed this, Whether he have any thing truly to alledge, why upon the former Accuſation he ſhould not be condemned? And ſo he muſt be juſtified indeed by producing his Faith, (and ſo his ſincere Obedience to teſtifie his Faith) yet not as a new Righteouſneſs of his own, but only as intitling him to Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, as that whereby he muſt be juſtified. 25.

Whereas you ſpeak of a Three-fold Guilt, *viz.* [1. *Reatus culpæ.* 2. *Reatus non-præſtitæ Conditionis.* 3. *Reatus pœnæ propter non præſtitam conditionem*]. 1. As *Omne malum eſt vel Culpæ, vel Pœnæ*, ſo *omnis reatus* ſeems to be ſo too. 2. The not-performing of a Condition, as a Condition, brings no new guilt of Puniſhment, (if it did, ſurely it were *Culpa*, and ſo the ſecond Mem- *Ibid.*

ber

ber falls in with the first) but only the loss of the Remedy, or Reward promised upon the performing of that Condition; though the not performing of the Condition as a Duty, will bring a new guilt of Punishment. 3. Therefore the *Reatus pœnæ* is not properly *ob non præstitam Conditionem*, but *ob culpam admissam*, which *Reatus* doth remain in force, because the Condition required for the removing of it, is not performed.

26. We must take heed of straining Law-terms too far in Matters of Divinity. I see not how the firmness of my title to Christ's Righteousness for Justification, may properly be called my Righteousness, whereby I am justified, though the firmness of that title may be questioned, and must be proved; yet if it prove false, it is not that properly which doth condemn, (I speak of the Meritorious Cause of Condemnation) but sin committed against the Law, is that which doth put into a state of Condemnation, and for want of that Title, there is nothing to free from Condemnation.

Ibid. The Obligation unto Punishment is not dissolved by Satisfaction made by Christ, as to Unbelievers, because for want of Faith, the Satisfaction of Christ is not imputed unto them.

Ibid. 1. For that far greater Punishment, which you speak of, I have said enough before. 2. Is that Non-liberation from former misery a distinct punishment from that misery? Though the former misery may be aggravated by neglect of that which would procure a liberation from it. If God had never made a New Covenant, there had certainly been a Non-liberation from that misery, which the breach of the first Covenant did bring upon us; and under that misery they must lie for ever, who neglect the Remedies provided for them; and as their neglect doth aggravate their sin, so will it encrease their Condemnation.

Ibid. The Immunity doth result from the New Covenant, the Penality from the Old, unto which Unbelievers are left, the New Covenant affording them no Remedy by reason of their unbelief: and the Penality of the Old Covenant is accidentally increased by the New Covenant, in that by neglect of its Remedy sin is increased.

Ibid. I am of this opinion, That the New Covenant hath no other Penality, but that it doth leave Unbelievers to the Penality

Penality of the Old Covenant, and by accident increaſe the ſame.

If that Penality be but the ſame Death, it hath no more than the former; neither can that Act of Grace be properly ſaid to appoint a new Puniſhment, but only to leave to the former Puniſhment, as not delivering from it. You ſpeak indeed of Double Torments appointed by that Act for ſuch as do reject it; but ſo (I think) the Similitude doth not hold. For I ſee not, that the Covenant of Grace doth ſo, but only (as I have ſaid) leave ſome upon their not performing the Condition required of them, to the Puniſhment appointed by the Covenant of Works; which Puniſhment will be the ſorer, as Sin by neglect of Grace offered is the greater. *Ibid.*

3. Though our Mediator do not believe, repent and obey for us, but we our ſelves muſt believe, repent and obey, yet it doth not follow that our believing, repenting and obeying, is that Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified. *Ibid.*

4. Though we be not guilty of not performing the Condition of the New Covenant, yet this is not properly our Righteouſneſs, by which we are juſtified, though without it we cannot be juſtified, becauſe not partake of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs. 27.

5. The rejecting of Chriſt may be conſidered; 1. As the receiving of Chriſt is a Duty Commanded. 2. As the receiving of Chriſt is the Condition of Pardon and Salvation offered. In the former reſpect, the rejecting of Chriſt is properly a ſin, and ſo againſt the Law, though aggravated by the Goſpel, in that Chriſt is rejected notwithſtanding all the benefit to be obtained by him. That the Law doth not ſpeak of Chriſt, is nothing; for it ſpeaks of obeying God in all his Commands, and ſo implicitly it ſpeaks of receiving Chriſt, when God doth command it. In the latter reſpect the rejecting of Chriſt (I think) doth not properly bring a new guilt, but only continue and aggravate the former.

6. But *recurrit queſtio*, viz. Whether the New Law doth require the Condition as our Righteouſneſs: it ſeems to me to require it only to that end, that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs may be imputed unto us, and that ſo by that Righteouſneſs we may be juſtified.

7. Faith, as a Duty, is a Conformity to the Law, though

though a partial and imperfect Conformity unto it, and so there's no being justified by it. As a Condition, it is a conformity to the Gospel, but no Righteousness by which we are justified, though a Condition upon performing of which we are justified by Christ's Righteousness.

8. I deny that there is any other condemnation of the Gospel, but only a not-freeing in some case from the condemnation of the Law.

9. The Condition being considered meerly as a Condition, and not as a Duty, to object that we have not performed the Condition, is not to bring a new Accusation, but only to take away the Plea, why the old Accusation should not prevail against us.

10. The performance of the Condition of the New Covenant, being designed to that use, which you mention, *viz.* [*to be the sinners self-denying acknowledgment of his sin and misery, and insufficiency to deliver himself*] it doth hence rather follow, that properly it is not our Righteousness, by which we are justified, though it be required of us to that end, that we may be justified by Christ's Righteousness.

11. That the Condition is not of so large extent as the Duty commanded, seems not to the purpose, the Question being of the Condition as a Condition, not as a Duty. Faith as a Duty (I grant) is part of our Personal Righteousness; but that is not it by which we are justified.

12. As the Condition is a Condition, and no more, so the performing of it is no *Justitia* at all: as it is a Duty, so indeed the performing of it is *Justitia particularis, & secundum quid*, as the performing of every Duty is: but such a *justitia* I dare not rely on for Justification. Whereas you say, *That Christ's Righteousness is not simply our Universal Righteousness*; it is true, if by [simply] you mean [*absolutè, & nullâ interpositâ conditione*] otherwise our Universal Righteousness it is, so that we have no need of any other Righteousness for our Justification, though we have need of some thing to that end, that we may partake of Christ's Righteousness, and be justified by it.

28. 13. The Gospel as distinct from the Law, doth shew us our Remedy; the Law as distinct from the Gospel, doth

doth prescribe unto us our Duty. Or if the Gospel also doth prescribe unto us our Duty, yet no other Duty, though upon other terms than the Law doth prescribe. However, though the performing of the Duty be in some sort our Righteousness, yet it is not that Righteousness by which we are justified. Still I distinguish of Believing considered as a Duty, and considered as a Condition. As a Duty, it is our Righteousness, but not that whereby we are justified; as a Condition, it is that whereby we are justified, but not our Righteousness; it is only that whereby we receive Righteousness, *viz.* the Righteousness of Christ, that Righteousness indeed by which we are justified. Whereas you say, [*The difference of the two Laws or Covenants, is the main ground which shews the necessity of a Two-fold Righteousness*]. The necessity of a Two-fold Righteousness is not denied, but only the necessity of a Two-fold Righteousness unto Justification.

This Two-fold Justification seems to be a new conceit. I remember not that you spake any thing of it in your *Aphorisms*; neither (I think) will it easily be granted because of your Positions and Suppositions, but rather they will be rejected, as inferring that which is not to be admitted. For truly where the Gospel doth speak of more Justifications than one, (in that sence as we treat of Justification) I am yet to seek. *Ibid.*

From a Two-fold Covenant you infer a Two-fold Justification. But is there a Two-fold Covenant, by which we are or may be justified? I conceive, we are justified only by the New Covenant. For *by the Deeds of the Law* (the Old Covenant) *shall no flesh be justified*, Rom. 3. 20. See also *Acts* 13. 39. *Ibid.*

1. To be accused as an Unbeliever, and a Rejecter of Christ, &c. is to be accused as a sinner, and as one that did not continue in all things written in the Law to do them. For else Unbelief and rejecting of Christ were no sin; that Christ is not spoken of in the Law, is nothing, as I have shewed before. 2. That Accusation (that a Man is an Unbeliever, and a Rejecter of Christ) if it be made good, doth leave a Man to the Law, and makes all its Accusations to be in force against him, with aggravation of his Sin for contempt of Mercy.

For

though a partial and imperfect Conformity unto it, and so there's no being justified by it. As a Condition, it is a conformity to the Gospel, but no Righteousness by which we are justified, though a Condition upon performing of which we are justified by Christ's Righteousness.

8. I deny that there is any other condemnation of the Gospel, but only a not-freeing in some case from the condemnation of the Law.

9. The Condition being considered meerly as a Condition, and not as a Duty, to object that we have not performed the Condition, is not to bring a new Accusation, but only to take away the Plea, why the old Accusation should not prevail against us.

10. The performance of the Condition of the New Covenant, being designed to that use, which you mention, *viz.* [*to be the sinners self-denying acknowledgment of his sin and misery, and insufficiency to deliver himself*] it doth hence rather follow, that properly it is not our Righteousness, by which we are justified, though it be required of us to that end, that we may be justified by Christ's Righteousness.

11. That the Condition is not of so large extent as the Duty commanded, seems not to the purpose, the Question being of the Condition as a Condition, not as a Duty. Faith as a Duty (I grant) is part of our Personal Righteousness; but that is not it by which we are justified.

12. As the Condition is a Condition, and no more, so the performing of it is no *Justitia* at all: as it is a Duty, so indeed the performing of it is *Justitia particularis, & secundum quid*, as the performing of every Duty is: but such a *justitia* I dare not rely on for Justification. Whereas you say, *That Christ's Righteousness is not simply our Universal Righteousness*; it is true, if by [simply] you mean [*absolutè, & nullâ interpositâ conditione*] otherwise our Universal Righteousness it is, so that we have no need of any other Righteousness for our Justification, though we have need of some thing to that end, that we may partake of Christ's Righteousness, and be justified by it.

28. 13. The Gospel as distinct from the Law, doth shew us our Remedy; the Law as distinct from the Gospel, doth

doth prescribe unto us our Duty. Or if the Gospel also doth prescribe unto us our Duty, yet no other Duty, though upon other terms than the Law doth prescribe. However, though the performing of the Duty be in some sort our Righteousness, yet it is not that Righteousness by which we are justified. Still I distinguish of Believing considered as a Duty, and considered as a Condition. As a Duty, it is our Righteousness, but not that whereby we are justified; as a Condition, it is that whereby we are justified, but not our Righteousness; it is only that whereby we receive Righteousness, *viz.* the Righteousness of Christ, that Righteousness indeed by which we are justified. Whereas you say, [*The difference of the two Laws or Covenants, is the main ground which shews the necessity of a Two-fold Righteousness*]. The necessity of a Two-fold Righteousness is not denied, but only the necessity of a Two-fold Righteousness unto Justification.

This Two-fold Justification seems to be a new conceit. *Ibid.* I remember not that you spake any thing of it in your *Aphorisms*; neither (I think) will it easily be granted because of your Positions and Suppositions, but rather they will be rejected, as inferring that which is not to be admitted. For truly where the Gospel doth speak of more Justifications than one, (in that sence as we treat of Justification) I am yet to seek.

From a Two-fold Covenant you infer a Two-fold Justification. But is there a Two-fold Covenant, by which we are or may be justified? I conceive, we are justified only by the New Covenant. For *by the Deeds of the Law* (the Old Covenant) *shall no flesh be justified*, Rom. 3. 20. See also *Acts* 13. 39. *Ibid.*

1. To be accused as an Unbeliever, and a Rejecter of Christ, &c. is to be accused as a sinner, and as one that did not continue in all things written in the Law to do them. For else Unbelief and rejecting of Christ were no sin; that Christ is not spoken of in the Law, is nothing, as I have shewed before. 2. That Accusation (that a Man is an Unbeliever, and a Rejecter of Christ) if it be made good, doth leave a Man to the Law, and makes all its Accusations to be in force against him, with aggravation of his Sin for contempt of Mercy. *Ibid.*

For

29. For the Authors which you cite, I can examine but few of them, because I have them not. *Bradshaw* (so *De Justif.* c. 24. §. 21. far as I see) makes nothing for you. He saith, *Bona opera quodammodo justificare dicuntur, quòd fidem, ipsamque adeò justificationem nostram arguendo, ac comprobando, utramque ista ratione justificent.* This is but what others say, That Faith doth justifie the Person, and Works justifie the Faith: and that is indeed no more than what all Protestants do say, *viz.* That Works declare and manifest Faith to be such as whereby the Person is justified: and that therefore a Man is said to be justified by Works, because thereby he appears to have Faith, whereby he is justified.

Ibid. §. 23. Again he saith, *Obedientia non minùs quàm ipsa (ex quâ oritur) fides ad salutem æternam est nobis necessaria, utpote sine quâ justitiam Christi imputatam prodesse nobis posse spes nulla existat.* This is but what Protestants generally acknowledge, That Obedience is necessary as a Fruit of Justifying Faith; so that without Obedience it is in vain to think of being justified by Christ's Righteousness: Yet is not our Obedience therefore a Righteousness, by which we are justified.

Ibid. §. 25. Again he saith, *Cujuslibet Christiani, quicum actu Deus in gratiam rediit, duplex est Justitia; Imputata una, Inhærens altera.* But he doth not say, That we are justified by Inherent, as well as by Imputed Righteousness: He is as far from that as other Protestants generally are; and other Protestants generally are as ready to assert the necessity of that Two-fold Righteousness, as he is.

Ibid. §. 26. Again he saith, *Per justitiam Christi nobis imputatam non possimus dici absolutè sive omni modo justi*, &c. He means, We are not freed from future Obedience, though we be freed from the guilt of Disobedience. This (except Libertines) none, I presume, will deny. But all this, as to the Controversie betwixt us about a Two-fold Righteousness requisite unto Justification, is (that I see) just nothing. But concerning *Bradshaw*, and the places which you point at in him, I observe, that §. 21. is twice so figured, and therefore which of the two you did intend, may be a question. I before noted what is in the former; but in the latter there is something, which peradventure you intended, though I judg it as little to your

your purpose as the rest. He saith, *Nova Nostra Obedientia pro gradu suo, & mensurâ, etiam justitia nostra dicitur, quâ & formaliter, inherenter, habitualiter, sivè ex operibus justi (pro ipsius modulo) coram Deo etiam verè dicamur, utpote cujus ratione pro justis ex parte à Deo ipso censeamur, cujusque intuitu etiam in foro divino aliquo modo (si id opus esset) justificari possimus.* But, 1. you see what mincing of the matter here is; [*Pro gradu suo & mensurâ: Pro ipsius modulo: ex parte: Aliquomodo: si id opus esset*]. This is not to the Point we have in hand, who speak of universal and entire Justification. 2. Here he makes against you; for he clearly makes Inherent Righteousness imperfect, [*cujus ratione pro justis ex parte à Deo censemur*] whereas you hold all Righteousness to be perfect, or none at all. What you mean by citing *Wotton de Reconcil.* part 1. lib. 2. cap. 18. I cannot imagine, for nothing do I there see for you, but much against you, though touching other Particulars in debate betwixt us. As in the very beginning of the Chapter; *Ex efficientibus Justificationis causis reliqua est Fides, quam Instrumenti locum obtinere diximus.* And the title of the Chapter is, *Quomodo Fides Causa Instrumentalis Justificationem Nostram operetur.* And *pag.* 100. he cites and approves that of *Downam, Fides sola est, qua nobis jus tribuit ad omnes Dei promissiones in Evangelio consequendas,* &c. And *pag.* 103. that of our Church; *Nihil ex hominis parte flagitatur ad ipsius justificationem, praeter veram & vivam fidem.* And immediately after he adds; *Neque tamen hac Fides spem, dilectionem, timorem, panitentiam excludere censenda est, quasi ad eum, qui justificandus est, non pertinerent, sed hac omnia ab officio justificandi (N. B.) significantur penitus excludi. Atque hoc quidem justificandi munus solis Fidei convenire, his rationibus ostendo,* &c. The rest of the Chapter is taken up with those Reasons. Now what there is for your purpose, judg you. The next place which you refer me to, is more punctually cited, *viz. part* 2. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 35. *pag.* 383. but neither there do I find any thing that makes for you. He there answers *Bellarmine*'s Arguments, whereby he would prove, That *Fides est solus assensus, non etiam fiducia:* But what is this *ad rhombum?* I know not whether you may lay hold on those words,

words, *Fidem Justificantem, sive quatenus Justificat, non esse unam virtutem, nec ullam quidem virtutem, sed justificare omninò, & solummodò ex officio & loco, qua Deus misericors illi sponte & liberè concessit, ut dixi parte* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 28. So it is printed, but it should be *cap.* 18. for there are but nineteen Chapters of that Book. What you can gather from this (if this were it you aimed at) I cannot tell, especially he referring us to the other place before mentioned, where there is much against you, but nothing (I think) for you. And as little for your purpose do I meet with in *part* 2. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 7. *pag.* 144. where he only saith, *Accedat etiam oportet, ut idonei simus, quibus aditus ad Cœlum pateat, habitualis justitia sive Sanctitas, de quâ,* &c. *Mat.* 5. 8. *Denique vita etiam sanctimoniâ, & bonis operibus opus est, ut Regnum Cœleste comparemus,* Heb. 12. 14. Matth. 25. 34, 35. But doth he say, That this Habitual Righteousness (which he maketh all one with Holiness, therein opposing you as I do) is requisite unto Justification? Otherwise that it is requisite, Who doth question? Whereas you next cite *part.* 2. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 5. *p.* 127. *n.* 3, 4. I doubt whether you did well observe what the Author there meaneth. He only answereth an Argument of *Hemingius*, denying that which (he saith) *Hemingius* supposeth, *viz. Eandem justitiam esse viam ad vitam æternam, cum in Lege, tum in Evangelio.* But of a Two-fold Righteousness he there makes no mention; not (I say) of a Two-fold Righteousness required of us at all, much less required of us, that thereby we may be justified. He saith indeed, *Quid enim si Lex Dei in decalogo sit norma illius justitiæ, quæ est via Vitæ Æternæ? Si præter hanc in Lege præscripta sit alia via in Evangelio constituta, quid impediet, quo minùs justificetur quispiam sine Legis impletione?* He doth not mean, That the Righteousness prescribed in the Law, is one Righteousness, and the Righteousness constituted in the Gospel another Righteousness, whereby we are justified; but that we are justified only by this latter, and not at all by the other. He was far from thinking of your Legal and Evangelical Righteousness, as being both necessary unto Justification; he only asserts Evangelical Righteousness as necessary in that respect, which Righteousness he makes to consist meerly in remission of sins.

ſins. See *part. 1. lib. 2. cap. 2. n. 13. & cap. 3. per totum.* To the very ſame purpoſe (*i.e.* nothing at all to yours) is that *Ibid. cap. 6. p. 138. n. 2.* where he taxeth *Hemingius* for taking it as granted, *Nullam eſſe juſtitiam, vel injuſtitiam, niſi in Lege præſtitâ, vel non præſtitâ:* And then he ſaith, *Nam ſi alia ſit juſtitia, quæ Lege non contineatur, fieri poteſt, ut alia etiam ſit via Æterna Vitæ conſequendæ.* He doth not grant (as you ſeem to underſtand him) that *Juſtitia, quæ in Lege continetur eſt una juſtitia, quæ ad Juſtificationem à nobis requiritur*; for that indeed he denies, and ſaith, That there is another Righteouſneſs now in the Goſpel ordained for that end; and remiſſion of ſins (as I ſaid) he makes to be that Righteouſneſs, even the only Righteouſneſs by which we are formally juſtified. Immediately after indeed he adds that which I cannot allow; *Verum nec peccatum quidem Legis in Decalogo cancellis circumſcribitur.* This is not directly to the Point now in hand; yet becauſe it may reflect upon it, and ſomewhat we have about it afterward; I therefore think meet to note it by the way, and ſay, That if it be as he ſaith, then (it ſeemeth) St. *John* did not give us a full definition of ſin, when he ſaid, *Sin is a tranſgreſſion of the Law*; but of that more hereafter. *Wotton*'s Argument is of ſmall force; *Fides (inquit) in Chriſtum crucifixum non præcipitur in Lege:* but I have before him, ſhewed that it is otherwiſe. He himſelf preſently after cites that, *1 John 3. 23.* [*This is his Commandment, That we believe,* &c.] Now the Law contained in the Decalogue, requires us to do whatſoever God commandeth; for if we do not ſo, we do not make him our only Lord God, as the Law requireth. That the Apoſtle doth oppoſe (as he ſaith) Faith to the Law, *Gal. 3. 12.* makes nothing for him. For Faith, as a Duty, is required in the Law, though as a Condition it be required only in the Goſpel. Neither doth that advantage him, which he alſo objecteth, That the Law hath nothing to do with Chriſt as Mediator, *Gal. 5. 4.* For though the Goſpel only hold out Chriſt as Mediator to be believed in; yet Chriſt being ſo held out, the Law doth require us to believe in him. For the Law doth require a belief of every Truth that God doth reveal, and a performance of every thing that God doth enjoyn. Now for *Lud. de Dieu*, If the Juſtification which

1 *Joh.* 3. 4.

he speaks of, *Quâ ut sanctificati ac regeniti absolvimur à falsis Diaboli & improborum criminationibus*, be meant of some particular Acts, of which we are accused, it is but such a Justification as the Reprobates themselves may partake of, who may be accused of some things whereof they are not guilty. See *Bradshaw de Justif. cap.* 25. If it be meant of our estate in general, (as I suppose it is) then this is indeed no distinct Justification, but only a confirming of the other. For in vain do we pretend to be justified by Faith, (by which alone *de Dieu* grants we are justified) so as through Christ to be freely acquitted from the guilt of our sins, if yet we remain unregenerate and unsanctified. By the way I observe, That *de Dieu*'s words are against you, [Jacobus *non agit de Justificatione, quæ partim fide, partim operibus peragatur*]. Thus much I had said in reference to this Author before I had him upon the Epistles; but now that I have him, I shall speak more fully to him, or to you of him, from that other place to which you remit me, *viz.* his Notes on *Rom.* 8. 4. There he speaks likewise of a Two-fold Righteousness, and of a Two-fold Justification, yet so as but little to patronize your Cause. Besides Imputed Righteousness, which we have in Christ, there is also (he saith, and who doth not?) an Inherent Righteousness which we have in our selves. The former Righteousness (he saith) is that, *Quâ nos Deus, etsi in nobis ipsis Legi adhuc dissormes, plenè tamen, ipsius etiam Legis Testimonio, justificat, eique pro omnimò conformibus habet in capite Christo: de quâ justificatione Apostolus supra*, cap. 3. & 4. & 5. *multis disputavit. Altera est, de quâ*, Rom. 6. 13. Ephes. 4. 24. 1 Joh. 3. 7. *Quâ nos Deus per regenerationem in nobis etiam ipsis Lege ex parte conformatos, ex parte nunc justificat, & indies justificat magis ac magis, prout incrementum capit regeneratio, ac justificabit plenè, ubi perfectio advenerit, de quâ Justificatione agitur*, Jac. 2. 21, 24. Apoc. 22. 11. Mat. 12. 37. 1 Reg. 8. 32. *Hanc justificationem Opera Legis ingrediuntur; ut primam constituit sola Fides, i. e. justitia Christi fide imputata, non opera; sic alteram constituunt opera, non fides.* Here, 1. he makes Inherent Righteousness imperfect, and so also the Justification which doth arise from it. By this Righteousness we are but *Legi ex parte conformati*, &

ex parte nunc juſtificati: But Imputed Righteouſneſs, and Juſtification by it, he acknowledgeth to be perfect: hereby we are *plenè juſtificati*, *tanquam Legi plenè conformes in capite Chriſto*. He makes Faith only, *i. e.* (as he explains it) the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed by Faith, that whereby we are fully and perfectly juſtified. Now you make all Righteouſneſs, as ſuch, perfect: for otherwiſe you make it to be no Righteouſneſs if it be imperfect. And you make Faith and Works to concur unto the ſame Juſtification, though you diſtinguiſh of the Inchoation, Continuation and Conſummation of it. You alſo make Faith properly taken to be the Righteouſneſs (though not the only Righteouſneſs) by which we are juſtified. So that *de Dieu*'s Opinion and yours are much different.

Again, *Sola Fides* (*inquit*) *amplectens iſtam obedientiam* (*ſc. Chriſti*) *imputatur in juſtitiam*, Ibid. *p.* 104.

And pag. 105. *Fidei imputatio eſt in juſtitiam perfectam, qualis eſt Obedientia Chriſti. Operum imputatio in imperfectam, qualia ſunt ipſa Opera in hâc vitâ.*

And *pag.* 109. he cites *Bucer* in *Colloq. Ratisb.* as agreeing with him, and ſaying thus, *Dixeramus nos, ſecuti Apoſtolum, & omnem Scripturam, duplicem eſſe Sanctorum juſtitiam, quâ juſti ſunt coram Deo & hominibus. Unam Chriſti, perfectam, quâ illis ſpes omnis gratiæ Dei, & ſalutis vitæque ſempiternæ tota nititur. Alteram in ipſis per Spiritum Chriſti inchoatum, quâ conſidere non debent, propterea quòd ea imperfecta ſemper eſt, dum hîc vivunt, & Deo non niſi ex liberali & infinitâ ejus miſericordiâ, & merito Chriſti probari non poteſt. Hâc juſtitia nemo juſtificatur coram Deo juſtificatione vitæ.---- Juſtitiam hanc Inchoatam ſentimus eſſe quidem veram & vivam Juſtitiam, Dei præclarum & eximium donum, vitamque novam in Chriſto hâc juſtitiâ conſtare, omneſque Sanctos hac ipſâ quoque juſtitia juſtos eſſe, & coram Deo, & coram hominibus, & propter eam Sanctos quoque à Deo juſtificari juſtificatione Operum*, i. e. *comprobari eos à Deo, laudari, & remunerari. Attamen quamlibet hæc juſtitia ſit vera ac viva, & ſuo etiam modo* (*N. B.*) *juſtificans, tamen non eſſe ejuſmodi, non ſic veram vivam & ſolidam, ut quiſquam Sanctorum juſtificari ea poſſit juſtificatione*

vita, multo minus ut sit ipsa justitia vel justificatio vita.

Thus then *de Dieu* in the Matter it self doth not differ from other Protestant-Writers, who generally hold, That the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, is that by which we are fully and perfectly justified; and yet we must also have Inherent Righteousness, which will justifie us in some sort, but not fully and perfectly, because it self is imperfect.

For *Placeus* I have him not; but because you alledge his words, I will say something to him. He speaks indeed of a Two-fold Accusation, and of a Two-fold Justification. But, 1. he seems to differ from me and others only *modo loquendi*. For he saith, *Ab accusatione priore (qua sc. objicitur nos esse peccatores) sola fide justificamur; qua Christi gratiam & justitiam amplectimur: a posteriore, (qua objicitur nos esse infideles) justificamur etiam operibus, quatenus iis Fides (N. B.) ostenditur.* This seems to be in effect the same with that of *Maccovius, Conciliationem hîc (inter* Paulum & Jacobum) *hanc ponunt Theologi, & quidem ex Scriptura, sola Fides nos justificat apprehensivè, opera declarativè.* 2. To speak properly, they are not (I think) two distinct Accusations. For to omit this, That to be *Infideles*, is to be *Peccatores*; and so the one Accusation doth include the other: To omit this (I say) the latter Accusation is but a re-inforcing of the former. Thou art a Sinner, saith the Accuser, and therefore to be condemned. Not so, saith the Party accused, for I am a Believer, and therefore justified. Hereupon the Accuser replies, Nay, it is not so as thou pretendest, thou art indeed no Believer, therefore the guilt of thy sins is upon thee, and thou art under condemnation. All this is but one Accusation, prosecuted and confirmed against a Plea made against it. If they were distinct Accusations, then we might be freed from the one, and yet be condemned by the other: but it is here quite otherwise. For the force of the former Accusation doth depend upon the latter; neither are we freed from the former, except we be freed from the latter; whereas you seem to carry it so, as if we were first justified from the former Accusation, and then were again to be justified from the latter: this seems to be the result of your Opinion.

De Fide Justif. Disp. 12.

1. Be-

1. Because I grant Faith to be required of us, that so Christ's Righteousness may become ours, do I therefore make Faith it self to be our Righteousness, *viz.* that whereby we are fully justified. A part of Inherent Righteousness (I grant) Faith is, by which we may be justified in some measure; but that is not the justification here enquired of. 2. You should not put me to prove, That your Assertion is without Scripture; it is sufficient for me to say it, until you alledge Scripture for it. 3. Christ's Satisfaction is solely and wholly our Righteousness, whereby we are justified from all Condemnation, though except we believe in him, we cannot enjoy that benefit by him; See 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult.* and *Acts* 13. 30. 30. 4. The New Covenant doth hold out unto us Christ's Righteousness to be made ours by Faith, that so we may be freed from the Condemnation of the Old Covenant, to which Condemnation we are left, if we believe not; and our Condemnation will be so much the sorer, by how much the sin in neglecting so great Salvation is the greater. 5. I confess indeed that there is more than Faith in the Condition of the New Covenant, but not as to Justification. For that which you add, [James *saith, We are justified by Works, and Christ by our Words*]; the question is not, Whether we be said to be justified by our Works or Words; but how and in what sense we are said to be so justified. There is a Particular Justification, and a Declarative Justification; thus we are justified by our Works and Words: but a full and formal Justification is only by Christ's Righteousness through Faith imputed unto us. 6. To say, That we are healed partly by the Medicine, and partly by the Application, I still think to be improper; neither do you bring any thing, whereby to shew the propriety of it. The Application of the Medicine is indeed requisite, yet it is the Medicine properly that doth heal, though not except there be an Application of it. Common Speech is not always Proper Speech; neither can any that are acquainted with Scripture, and know how to distinguish between Proper and Improper Speeches, think it strange that there are improper Speeches found in Scripture. What will you say of those, [*This is my Body*] [*The Rock was Christ*] and a hundred such-like? For Rules of Logick, if you had made use of any, I might have considered of them. 7. May (*p.* 36.)

not a Similitude illustrate, though there be such a difference as you speak of, betwixt that from which it is fetched, and that to which it is applied? But why do you joyn Repentance and Obedience with Faith in point of Justification; I speaking only of Faith, and you as yet having said nothing for the joint interest of the other? 8. In your *Aphorisms* you plainly assert two distinct Righteousnesses, as requisite unto Justification; that there you make them subordinate, is more than I observe. But though Faith be subordinate unto Christ's Satisfaction in the matter of Justification, yet that we are justified by Faith as a distinct Righteousness, I cannot yeeld, no more than that the Application of a Medicine is a distinct Medicine by which one is healed. I am glad that you plainly disclaim a Coordination of Christ's Righteousness and Faith in the Work of Justification: But if they be but subordinate, then (me-thinks) they should not be two distinct Righteousnesses, by which we are justified. I see not how we can be justified (I speak of an Universal Justification, opposite to all condemnation, that which *Bucer* calls *Justificationem Vitæ*) both by the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and also by our own personal Righteousness. You say, [*A Man having a Medicine, and not applying it, may properly be said to die for want of Application*]; but to speak properly, I think, It is not the want of Application of the Medicine, but the Disease that doth kill the Man: So though a Man wanting Faith shall be condemned, yet take Faith meerly as a Condition, not as a Duty, it is not properly the want of Faith, but Sin that is the cause of his Condemnation; though his want of Faith may as aggravate his Sin, so increase his Condemnation.

Apud. Lud. de Dieu in *Rom.* 8. 4.

Ibid. 20. 108.

That I speak your words, is more than I do know. How Christ's Righteousness may be called our Legal Righteousness, I shewed by *Rom.* 10. 4. viz. as serving us instead of that Righteousness which the Law required of us, and for want of which the Law otherwise would have condemned us. Neither did I blame you meerly for calling Christ's Satisfaction our Legal Righteousness, but for making another Righteousness of our own, which you call our Evangelical Righteousness, necessary unto Justification. Now also you overlook that, which I alledged about Christ's Satisfaction, as being our Evangelical Righteousness.

(*p.* 36.)

1. Doth

1. Doth the Old Covenant prescribe Christ's Satisfaction as our Righteousness? You said a little before, [*I do not think, that Christ's Righteousness of Satisfaction is that which the Law required*]; as if I said, That the Law did require it; whereas I meant only this, That the Law required Satisfaction, and Christ made it for us, so that Christ's Satisfaction serveth us instead of that Righteousness which the Law required of us, and so may be called our Legal Righteousness. But the New Covenant doth hold out Christ's Righteousness to be apprehended by us, and made ours by Faith, that so thereby we may be justified. Where the Scripture speaks of a Two-fold Righteousness so as you do, or how this makes for the unfolding of the main Doctrine, or tends to heal our Breaches, I do not see: You affirm these things, but do not prove them. 2. What plain ground you laid down in your *Aphorisms* for that Two-fold Righteousness, I do not know: What I could observe any way Argumentative, I was willing to examine, and so am still. *Ibid.* [*Ib.* 110.

1. If it imply Blasphemy, to say, That Christ repented, and believed for us; Doth it follow that Faith or Repentance is our Righteousness, by which we are justified? Can nothing be required of us, and performed by us, but it must therefore be our Righteousness, and by it as our Righteousness we must be justified? 2. The Scriptures which I alledged, (viz. *Rom.* 9. 29. & 10. 6. *Gal.* 5. 5. and *Rom.* 3. 22.) do sufficiently distinguish Faith from that Righteousness, whereby we are justified, and shew it to be only a means, whereby we partake of Christ's Righteousness, and so by that Righteousness of Christ are justified. The Argument (I think) is good, notwithstanding any thing you say unto it. Faith is only a means whereby Christ's Righteousness is imputed unto us unto Justification: Therefore it is not that Righteousness by which we are justified, *Rivet* speaking of the Remonstrants saith, *Volunt igitur Fidem cum operibus Justif. venire in partem justitiæ debitæ, & Fidem justificare, non Relativè, ut organum apprehendens objectum, sed Inhærenter*, &c. *Hoc iniquitatis mysterium*, &c. 31. 21. 111. *De Fide* §. 15. & 16

1. You might easily know what I meant by [Simply and Absolutely justified in the sight of God], if you did well consider the other Members of the distinction, *viz.* to be wholly freed from all Condemnation; the same *Ibid.*

that Mr. *Bradshaw* meant by Universal Justification: You know sufficiently the distinction betwixt *Simpliciter* or *Absolutè*, & *secundum quid*. *Bradshaw* having said, *Hoc modo* (*sc. justificatione particulari*) *non Electi soli, sed & Reprobi ipsi coram Deo Justificari possunt*: Adds immediately, *Neutri vero eorum absolute hoc modo justificari possunt.* ---- *Hoc modo justificari non est penitus à peccati reatu, sed ab hujus vel illius peccati imputatione injustâ liberari.* 2. Comparative Righteousness I shewed to be but a less degree of Unrighteousness: but Ironical Righteousness is down-right Unrighteousness, whereas a less Unrighteousness in comparison of a greater, is a kind of Righteousness. *Minus malum respectu majoris habet rationem boni.* 3. I do not deny the Righteousness of Faith, though I deny Faith to be that Righteousness by which we are justified. Though our Salvation depend upon our Faith, and sincere Obedience, yet are we not therefore justified by Obedience, but *Declarativè*, as it is the fruit of Justifying Faith; nor by Faith, but *Apprehensivè*, as by it we apprehend and receive Christ's Righteousness.

Ibid. & 32. 1. I never doubted, much less denied Faith to be a part of Inherent Righteousness. 2. It is indeed a strange Righteousness, that will not justifie so far forth as it will reach: but it is not strange to Protestant-Divines, that Inherent Righteousness cannot reach so far as to justifie in that sense as we speak of Justification. *Illud concedimus*, (*inquit* Daven.) *esse in omnibus justificatis justitiam quandam inherentem, quam si formalem causam statuant Justificationis*, (*liceat enim vocabulum procudere*) *non repugnabimus: sed predicta Justificationis, qua respondet stricto examini Cœlestis Judicis, nec formalu, nec meritoria esse ullo modo potest.* And he lays down these two Positions;

De Justif. Habit. cap. 22.

Ibid. 1. *Christi Mediatoris, in nobis habitantis, atque per Spiritum sese nobis unientis, perfectissima Obedientia, est formalis causa justificationis Nostra, utpote qua ex donatione Dei, & applicatione Fidei fit nostra.* 2. *Justitia per Spiritum Christi nobis impressa & inherens, non est formalis causa, per quam stamus justificati, hoc est, per quam liberati judicamur à damnatione, & acceptati ad vitam aternam, tanquam eâdem digni per hanc qualitatem nobis inherentem.* That you may not catch at the word [*digni*], he afterward expresseth it thus; *Atque hic ne inanem de vocabulis*

Ibid. cap. 26.

cabulis velitationem instituamus, illud præmittendum nos per formalem causam Justificationis nihil aliud intelligere, quam illud, per quod stamus in conspectu Dei à damnatione liberati, innocentes, gratificati, & ad vitam æternam acceptati. And the whole Chapter is to prove that *Inherens Justitia non est formalis causa Justificationis Nostra coram Deo.* But it is a needless labour to cite Authors to this purpose. For what more common with our Divines (I speak of such as are of chief note) than to acknowledg Inherent Righteousness, and yet to deny that we are justified by it? What you mean, when you yeeld that we are not universally justified by Faith, I do not well understand. For if you mean (as you seem to do) that we are not freed by it from the Punishment of the Old Covenant, but only from the Punishment of the New Covenant; 1. I know no Punishment of the New Covenant, but a leaving to the Punishment of the Old Covenant, with an aggravation of it for contempt of Mercy offered. 2. Faith, though not as our Righteousness, yet as the means whereby we partake of Christ's Righteousness, doth free us from the Punishment of the Old Covenant, *viz.* Death. For *the Just shall live by Faith*, Rom. 1. 17. And in that sense Faith doth universally justifie us. For *being justified by Faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ*, Rom. 5. 1. Whereas you speak of justifying against the Accusation of Non-performing the Condition of the New Covenant; I must still tell you, That taking the Condition meerly as a Condition, the Accusation of non-performing it, is but a confirming a former Accusation of being guilty of the breach of the Old Covenant, and therefore to be condemned, as having no relief from the New Covenant, the Condition of it being not performed. 3. If I do ill oppose the Righteousness whereby we are justified, and the Righteousness whereby we are sanctified, as if the same thing might not be both; then welfare the Papists, who confound Justification and Sanctification. *Duræus* the Jesuite, in his Defence of *Campian*, saith, *Nova hæc*, Whitakere, *Theologia est, nos per gratiam infusam, vitæ novitatem ac sanctificationem adipisci, minimè tamen justificari. At quæ te, obsecro, Scriptura docuit Justificationem à Sanctificatione distinguere?* The same Righteousness that

Duræus Adversf. Whitak.

that doth sanctifie, cannot also justifie; because that Righteousness, which doth sanctifie, doth it but in part; but that which doth justifie, must do it fully, or else it is to little purpose. For (as *Bradshaw* observes) *even the Reprobate as well as others, may have a particular Justification.* 4. The Texts which I cited, (*Luk.* 1. 75. *Ephes.* 4. 24. *Psal.* 147. 17. *Apoc.* 22. 11.) seem to me to make the terms [*Righteousness and Holiness, Righteous and Holy*] *equipollent:* and that Text, *Psal.* 145. 17. speaks not of God's People, but of God himself, which (it seems) you did not observe. And why should you call it *tautologizing*, when two words are joined together as Synonima's? What is more frequent in Scripture than this? It hath more shew of tautology, when divers sentences importing the same thing, are joyned together; which yet is very usual. And as the Scriptures, so also our Divines do promiscuously use the words [Righteousness] and [Holiness]. *Davenant, Hanc ergo qualitatem justitiæ, sive Sanctitatis, quam Deus imprimit hominibus renatis, negamus esse causam formalem justificationis,* &c. So *Ames. Non excluditur justitia, seu Sanctitas inherens,* &c. 5. The Matter of our Righteousness, is that which is conformable to the Law: *Justum est, quod est secundum Legem; Injustum, quod contra Legem*; and so by your own confession is the matter of our Holiness.

De Justif. cap. 25.

De Just. Habit. cap. 26. *Bell. Ener.* Tom. 4. l. 6. c. 1. p. 126.

32. 1. They are no vulgar Divines, that say, Our Inherent Righteousness is imperfect; yea, and make this one principal Argument to prove that we are not justified by Inherent Righteousness. *Fides, & Spes, & Charitas* (*inquit* Whitakerus) *nos justos aliquo modo faciunt, sed inchoatè, non absolute. Lud. de Dieu,* and in him *Bucer* were cited before. Hear now *Davenant*; *Ipsa* (*inquit*) *justitia inherens, in se considerata, qualis reperitur in viatoribus, imperfecta est, atque caret illis perfectionis gradibus, qui ad justificationem perfectam necessario requiruntur. Vide etiam* Ibid. cap. 23. *ad Arg.* 6. Thus also *Amesius*; *Justitia quâ justificatur homo coram Deo, debet esse perfecta: Sed justitia nobis inhærens, non est talis. Ergo.* Wotton speaks not only for himself, but also for others, even our chiefest Divines; *Lutherus, Melanchthon, Calvinus, & Chemnitius, eâ potissimum causâ* (*N. B.*) *nos infusâ & inhærente justi-*

Contra Camp. ad Rat. 8. p. 178. *De Justif. Habit.* cap. 26. Arg. 4. *Contra Bellar.* Tom. 4. lib. 6. c. 1. Arg. 11. *De Recon.* par. 2. l. 1. c. 19.

tiâ

stitiâ justificari non posse contendunt, quòd illa in nobis ita imperfecta sit, ut in Dei conspectum, cum ad judicandum accedat, prodire non audeat.

And again; *Nihil profectò causæ erat, cur Vasquez in* 1. 2. *Disp.* 202. *n.* 26. *tantopere huic argumento confideret, ut illo potissimum niteretur: Perfectio nostræ justitiæ* (*inquit* Vasques) *non debet probari ex quibusdam Scripturæ testimoniis, in quibus commendatur perfecta & integra charitas, sed potius ex illis, in quibus docemur nobis inesse justitiam. Nam justitia non est, quæ vera, & perfecta non est.* *Ibid.* cap. 23.

And again; *Justitia nostra habitualis nobis à Deo infusa, non est perfecta.* And again; *Respondent nostri Theologi justitiam illam habitualem esse imperfectam.* *Ibid.* lib. 2. c. 16. & c. 19.

I will add one more, whom both you and I reverence, *viz.* Mr. *Blake*, He having spoken of some (he names none, but you know, I suppose, whom he meaneth) who grant Holiness to be imperfect, but will have Righteousness (our Personal Righteousness) by all means to be perfect; he adds, [This and much more to assert a personal perfect Inherent Righteousness, as is said] all which, as it is here held out, to me is new, and I must confess my self in ignorance all over. I never take Imperfect Righteousness to imply any such contradiction, no more than Imperfect Holiness. *Isaiah* (I am sure) saith, *All our Righteousnesses are as filthy Rags*, &c. See more afterward. Of the Covenant, *ch.* 16. *p.* 10

2. I take Righteousness to be a Conformity to the Law, which Conformity may be more or less perfect, as one may more or less come up to the Rule set before him. If I over-slipt any thing in your *Aphorisms*, you might have directed me to it; otherwise to search for it, may prove both a tedious and a fruitless labour.

That one thing may be more or less like another, is most evident, so that if all the wit in the World should conspire against it, yet one might as easily demonstrate it, as he did, who to prove *dari motum*, when one had disputed against it, rose up and walked. Is not the Similitude sometime more, sometime less, that is betwixt Parents and Children, and betwixt Children of the same Parents, especially Twinns? and so in other things? To deny this, what is it but to put out mens eyes, or to bid defiance unto common sense? *Ibid.* *Alio alio & similiter*, Alsted. *Metaph. lib.* 2. *c* 5. *Relata recipiunt magis & minus*, *Log.* l. 1. c. 7

minus, ſaith *Burgerſdicius*. Yet he ſaith, *Recipere magis & minus non convenit omnibus Relatis.* Surely there is great difference betwixt *Similitudo* and *Æqualitas*, ſo that neither *Scheibler* nor any Man elſe muſt think to carry it ſo, as if there were *eadem utriuſque ratio*; ſo that becauſe *Æqualitas conſiſtit in indiviſibili*s; therefore *ſimilitudo* muſt do ſo too. Perfect Righteouſneſs indeed is *quadam Æqualitas*, not ſimply all Righteouſneſs. That an Action cannot be conform to the Precept, except it be perfectly conform, you muſt prove as well as aſſert, before I can aſſent. I could yet ſee no reaſon to doubt of that which Mr. *Blake* ſaith, [*As an Image carrying an imperfect reſemblance of its Samplar, is an Image*; *ſo Conformity imperfectly anſwering to the Rule, is Conformity likewiſe*].

Of the Coven. c.16.p.111

33. 1. You do not well to confound Conformity and Equality. And though the Law require perfect Conformity, which none can perform, it doth not follow that imperfect Conformity is none at all. If a perfect Conformity to the Law could be performed by us, then we ſhould be juſtified by the Law, which we cannot be: yet the Regenerate conform to the Law in ſome meaſure, and ſo it behoves us to do; For *then ſhall I not be aſhamed, when I have reſpect to all thy Commandments*, Pſ.119.6. I let paſs your Second and Third. Ad 4. I do not ſpeak of Qualification conſidered abſolutely, but in reference to the Rule. Mr. *Blake* ſaith well, [*Neither do I underſtand how Holineſs ſhould be imperfect, taken materially, and Righteouſneſs perfect, taken formally, in reference to a Rule. We may (for ought I know) as well make Holineſs formal, and refer it to a Rule, and Righteouſneſs material, in an abſolute conſideration, without reference to any Rule at all. And in ſuch conſideration I do not know how there can be perfection or imperfection either in Holineſs or Righteouſneſs; it is as they come up, or fall ſhort of the Rule, that they have the denomination of perfection or imperfection*]. Holineſs and Righteouſneſs are oppoſite unto ſin: therefore formally conſidered, they are a Conformity to the Rule, as Sin is a deviation from it. The Conformity therefore of our Actions and Diſpoſitions to the Rule is not (as you ſay) the matter of our Righteouſneſs, but (as I conceive) it is the form; and our Actions and Diſpoſitions

Loc. cit.

ons themſelves are the matter of it, *viz.* of our Perſonal and Inherent Righteouſneſs; and ſo of our Holineſs. The Rule of Righteouſneſs (to which as we conform more or leſs, we are more or leſs righteous) is the Law, the ſum whereof is contained in the Decalogue: therefore it is ſaid, That Believers are under the Law as a Rule, though not under it as a Covenant. For *Pœna Evangelica*, of which you ſpeak, I have ſaid enough of it before.

To your Queries and Objections, I anſwer, Ad 1. Chriſt doth juſtifie the Unrighteous, God doth juſtifie the Ungodly, *Rom.* 4. 5. But how? They were unrighteous and ungodly before they were juſtified; they are not ſo when they are juſtified, though it is not their Perſonal Righteouſneſs or Godlineſs whereby they are juſtified. *Know ye not that the Unrighteous ſhall not inherit*, &c. *And ſuch were ſome of you, but you are waſhed*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10, 11. That of *Tarnovius*, cited by Mr. *Ball*, is uſeful here; *In Scriptura ſæpe res dicitur quod paulò antè fuit, ut cæci vident, ſurdi audiunt, claudi ambulant*, &c. Ad 2. The Law doth not juſtifie any but ſuch as are perfectly righteous; therefore they that are imperfectly, though truly righteous, cannot be juſtified by it. *Sumus verè juſti*, (ſaith *Davenant*) *non putativè, ſi reſpiciamus juſtitiam noſtram habitualem: ſed hæc veræ juſtitiæ eſt adhuc inchoata & imperfecta.* And again, *Sanctificationem noſtram non putativam & fictitiam, ſed veram & realem ſtatuimus.* Bellarmini *autem Dialecticam, qui inde concludit nos juſtificari juſtitiâ inherente, putativam arbitramur, & fictitiam.* And why ſhould not Imperfect Righteouſneſs be acknowledged True Righteouſneſs, as well as Imperfect Holineſs is acknowledged True Holineſs? That of the Apoſtle, *Epheſ.* 4. 24. [*in Righteouſneſs and true Holineſs*]; or, as the Original hath it, [*in righteouſneſs and holineſs of Truth*], attributes Truth as well to Righteouſneſs, (though imperfect) as to Holineſs. *Genitivus Veritatis* (ſaith *Calvin* on the place) *loco Epithetî poſitus eſt, qui tam juſtitiæ, quam ſanctitati convenit.* Ad 3. You ſeem quite to miſtake the meaning of that in *James* 2. 10. It makes nothing againſt an Imperfect Righteouſneſs, but only ſhews, That reſpect muſt be had to one Precept as well as to another be-

Ibid. & 34.

Of the Coven. p. 219.

De Juſt. Hab. c. 23. ad Arg. 7.

Ibid. ad Arg. 8.

cauſe

cause though a Man should keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, *viz.* so as wholly to wave it, and to have no respect unto it, he were guilty of all, his Obedience were indeed none at all. For to obey, is to do that which is commanded, because it is commanded. Now he that doth any one thing *eo nomine* because it is commanded, will indeavour to do every thing that is commanded. *A Quatenus ad omne*, &c. That this is the meaning of the words, is clear by *v.* 11. See *Calvin* on the place. Ad 4. The Law doth pronounce an imperfect Obeyer imperfectly righteous; and therefore if he be left to the Law, to stand or fall by it, he shall not be justified for his Righteousness, but shall be condemned for his Imperfection. Ad 5. The Damned and Devils cannot be pronounced Righteous according to the Law, as the Saints may. Is there no difference betwixt Imperfect Obedience, and Perfect (if it may be called Perfect) Disobedience? The Unregenerate do something that, but nothing as the Law requireth: the Regenerate do something both that, and as, though not so perfectly as the Law requireth. *De Just. Act. c. 34. Memb. 2.* *Licet modus agendi* (*inquit* Daven.) *bonus sit, quia agunt ex fide & charitate, tamen gradus in hoc modo deficit, quia non agunt ex tantâ fide & charitate quantâ ab ipsa Lege præcipitur.* It is granted, That the best action of any upon earth is not good and just according to the rigour of the Law; for the rigour of the Law requires it to be perfectly good and just, which it is not. But it follows not, that therefore it is not good and just at all. *Ibid. Cap. 26. ad fest. 7.* *Nam aliud est* (saith the same learned Author) *actionem esse veré bonam, aliud esse purè bonam, & ab omni vitio liberam: sicut aliud est aurum verum, aliud aurum purum, ab omni face depuratum.* That Rule therefore, *Bonum non nisi ex integrâ causâ oritur, malum ex quolibet defectu*, must be taken *cum grano salis*, *viz.* so as that the *Defectus* must be either in the substance of the Act, or in some material Circumstance: And of such Actions Dr. *Twisse* (whom you cite) doth speak; *Qui dat eleemosynam vanæ gloriæ studio*, &c. There is indeed some defect in the best Actions of the best Men, *quoad gradum*: But shall we therefore deny them to be good, because they are some way defective, and so not perfectly good? And see here I pray, to what you have now brought the matter; even to make Imperfect

Holiness

Holineſs no Holineſs, as well as Imperfect Righteouſneſs no Righteouſneſs. For is not Holineſs Goodneſs as well as Righteouſneſs? Therefore if every defect make Goodneſs no Goodneſs, then there is no more an Imperfect Holineſs (which yet you grant) then there is an Imperfect Righteouſneſs. Thoſe words, [*Neque putandum eſt, fieri poſſe, ut per Legem ſaltem aliquâ ex parte juſtificemur*] taken in *rigore* are not true. For then there were no ſuch thing as a particular Juſtification; neither do they accord with that which I cited before out of *Lud. de Dieu* on *Rom.* 8. 4. to which place you did refer me. Indeed we cannot be ſo juſtified by the Law, as thereby to be freed from all condemnation; and this ſeems to be all that your Author here cited did mean, when he ſaith, *Si non es Legem tranſgreſſus, Lege juſtificaris: ſi tranſgreſſus es, condemnaris.* But this doth no more prove, That Righteouſneſs muſt either be perfect, or it is none at all, (though indeed it is none as to abſolute and univerſal Juſtification) than it doth prove, that there is no Holineſs at all, except it be perfect. For doth not the Law require perfect Holineſs as well as perfect Righteouſneſs? And is not every tranſgreſſion of the Law a privation of Holineſs, as well as of Righteouſneſs? How then can you admit an Imperfect Holineſs to be Holineſs, and yet deny an Imperfect Righteouſneſs to be Righteouſneſs? And if our Inherent Righteouſneſs (for of that we ſpeak) muſt needs be perfect, if it be any at all, muſt not the ſame be ſaid of our Holineſs, this being a conformity to the Law as well as the other?

1. You do not anſwer my Queſtion, *viz.* Whether thoſe Orthodox Writers (a multitude of whom you ſay you could heap up) do make our Perſonal Righteouſneſs that by which we are juſtified. If they do not, their calling it Evangelical is to no purpoſe. 2. It is not prepoſterous to ſay, That Righteouſneſs (*viz.* inherent) is required unto Sanctification; it being that whereby we are ſanctified, as Imputed Righteouſneſs is that whereby we are juſtified. You ſaid before, That I did ill oppoſe that whereby we are juſtified, as if the ſame thing might not do both: You grant then (it ſeems) that Righteouſneſs may ſanctifie; I think it muſt, and ſo is required unto Sanctification. How you can make Inherent Righteouſneſs *ita ſe habere ad ſanctificationem, ut ſe habet* 34.

Albedo

Albedo ad Parietem, to me ſeems very ſtrange: rather (I think) *ut ſe habet Albedo ad Dealbationem*. 3. If you had ſpoken abſolutely without any qualification, [*He that affirmeth a Man Righteous*, (viz. *by Inherent Righteouſneſs*) *and yet denieth him to be juſtified*, viz. *by that Righteouſneſs, contradicteth himſelf*] you had condemned all our famous Divines (I think) of ſelf-contradiction. But your ſpeech being ſo qualified, as it is, [*ſo far as he is Righteous*] I know not at whom it ſtriketh. But though none by the Law of Works can be pronounced perfectly righteous, and therefore if they be tryed by it, all will be found unrighteous, yet doth it not therefore follow, that there is no ſuch thing as an Imperfect Righteouſneſs.

Ibid. — You ſeem not to diſlike what I ſay, neither do I what you now ſay. I grant, that the New Covenant is to the wicked an unſpeakable mercy, in that by it they may be freed from the condemnation of the Old Covenant: yet until they embrace the New Covenant, they remain under the Old, even under the condemnation of it.

35. 1. Concerning Chriſt's Satisfaction, how it may be called both our Legal and our Evangelical Righteouſneſs, I have ſpoken before. Legal Righteouſneſs may either ſignifie the Righteouſneſs of the Law, τῦ νόμυ, or the Righteouſneſs which is of or from the Law, ἐκ τῦ νόμυ. There is great difference between theſe two, for the former is aſſerted, but the latter is exploded, *Rom.* 8. 4. & 10. 5. *Phil.* 3. 9. Chriſt's Satisfaction may be called our Legal Righteouſneſs in the former ſenſe, not the latter. But in both reſpects it is our Evangelical Righteouſneſs, as being the Righteouſneſs of the Goſpel, τῦ ἐυαγγελίυ, *i. e.* the Righteouſneſs which the Goſpel doth hold out unto us, and the Righteouſneſs which is of or from the Goſpel, ἐκ τῦ ἐυαγγελίυ, *i. e.* the Righteouſneſs which by the Goſpel we are made partakers of through Faith. And therefore it is called the Righteouſneſs which is of Faith, ἐκ πίςεως, and by Faith, διὰ πίςεως, *Rom.* 9. 30. & 10. 6. *Phil.* 3. 9. 2. In that Faith is the Condition, or Inſtrument (or what any pleaſe to call it) whereby Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is made ours unto Juſtification, it rather follows, that Faith it ſelf is not properly our Righteouſneſs, by which we are juſtified.

Some-

Something out of *Rivet* I have cited before to this purpose; hear also what another saith, *viz. Vignerius*, whose Disputation *Rivet* much commends, and thought meet to annex it to his own, *Quidni in fide nostrâ gloriabimur, si ex fide justificatio est, ut operâ Evangelico, facti. Christi & appositâ fœderi conditione, contra Apostolum, qui exclusam esse dicit per Legem fidei gloriationem?* Rom. 3. 26. --- *An possibile est, ut sit fidei instrumentum accipiendæ justitiæ, & simul sit ipsa, quam quærimus, justitia? Utut sanè glorietur homo, solus tamen Christus est nostra justitia, nec aliud agit Fides, quam quòd Christum apprehendit, & nostram facit illius justitiam, ut in eo inveniamur, non nostram habentes justitiam, quæ ex Lege est, sed illam, quæ est per fidem Christi, justitiam, quæ est ex Deo per fidem*, Phil. 3. 9. *De Satisfact. inter opera Riveti, Disp. 13 §. 61.*

1. I see nothing in the place cited (*viz. Aphor.* p. 127, 128.) but a Similitude, which proves nothing; and I gave some touch of it in the *Animadversions*. Whereas you now say, [*In respect of the condition of our personal performance to make Christ's Satisfaction ours, Faith is imputed unto us instead of our personal performance of Perfect Obedience*], it seems to imply as if personal performance of Perfect Obedience might be required as a Condition to make Christ's Satisfaction ours, which were very strange. For if Perfect Obedience could be performed by us, what need were there of Christ's Satisfaction to be imputed to us, except for sin committed or contracted before this personal performance of perfect Obedience? *If Righteousness come by the Law, Christ died in vain*, Gal. 2. *ult.* But how-ever, such Obedience cannot be performed by any, there being *not a Just man upon Earth, that doth good, and sinneth not*, Eccles. 7. 20. That Faith is as effectual or sufficient a Condition under the New Covenant, as perfect personal Obedience, if performed, would have been under the Old Covenant: if this were all that you meant, though I like not your expression, yet I allow the thing; only this I think meet to observe, That perfect personal Obedience was so the Condition of the Old Covenant, that it was also the Righteousness required in it: But Faith is so the Condition of the New Covenant, as that it is not properly the Righteousness it self, but only a means to partake of Christ's Satisfaction, which is the Righteousness that the *Ibid.*

New Covenant doth offer and afford to a Believer, instead of Perfect Obedience personally to be performed by the Old Covenant. For that which you add about the paying of a Pepper-Corn, &c. I do not think that we can be said truly and properly to pay any thing our selves as a price, whereby to purchase the benefits of the New Covenant; see *Isa.* 55. 1. and *Apoc.* 22. 17. When we preach and press Holiness and Good Works, we use to distinguish betwixt *Via Regni & Causa regnandi*; and we make them requisite unto Glorification, but not unto Justification. *Dicimus* (*inquit* Rivetus) *bona opera necessaria esse, tanquam adjunctum consequens justificationem, tanquam effectum acquisita salutis, quatenus salus accipitur pro justificatione; & tanquam antecedens ad salutem, quatenus accipitur pro glorificatione; non autem tanquam causam, quæ salutem efficiat.*

Colleg. Controver. Disp. 36.

2. The acceptance of a Gift, being a means to enjoy it, is a means whereby the Gift doth inrich; and so Faith is a means whereby Christ's Righteousness doth justifie us, as being a means whereby it is imputed unto us, and made ours. But properly it is the Gift that doth inrich, though not without the acceptance of it; and so it is the Righteousness of Christ that doth justifie, though not without Faith. The Tryal of a Man's Title in Law to a Gift, depends on the Tryal, and Proof of his Acceptance of it, because otherwise except he accept of the Gift, it is none of his: Yet for all this, it is the Gift that doth inrich, though it must be accepted, that it may do it. And so it is Christ's Righteousness that we are justified by, though Faith be required of us, that it may be made ours, and so we may be justified by it.

36. That my words are contradictory one to another, you say, but the Reason which you add for proof of it, is of little force. I deny it to be as proper to say, [*We are justified by Faith as a Condition*] as to say, [*We are justified by Christ's Satisfaction, as the Meritorious Cause*]; yea and as the Righteousness by which we are justified. What inconvenience doth arise from it, if *Paul* and the Scriptures do oftner speak improperly than properly in this Point? May not improper Speeches, concerning some Point, be more frequent in Scripture, than proper? Sacramental Speeches, wherein the Sign is called by the name of the Thing signified, are improper: Yet are they

more

more frequent in Scripture, than those which in that kind are more proper.

1. You not clearing the Question, either there or any where else (that I know) in your *Aphorisms*, seemed to leave it doubtful; and so I thought meet to note it, that you might prevent any ones stumbling at it. *Ibid.*

2. What you now add upon review, doth less please; For the Holiness that is in us, is from God, the imperfection of it is from our selves; this therefore may be sinful, though God's Work be good.

1. Relation when it is founded in Quality, may (for any thing I see) be intended and remitted, as the Quality is wherein it is founded. I like not *Scheiblers* joyning Similitude and Equality together, as if there were the same reason of both. One thing cannot be more or less equal, though it may be nearer to, or further from Equality than another; but one thing may be more or less like, when yet there is a true and proper likeness in both. *Ibid.* *Vide Alsted. Metaphys.* lib. 2. c. 5.

2. That no Man ever performeth one act fully and exactly conform to the Law of Works, is the same that I say: But why do you put in these terms [*fully and exactly*] if there can be no conformity but that which is full and exact?

3. That our Inherent Righteousness (for I must still mind you that we are speaking of it) is *Non-reatus pœnæ*, I deny; and all that you add there in that Page is impertinent, as being nothing to Inherent Righteousness, about which now is all the Dispute. *Pag.* 37. You seem to come up to what I say, when you grant, that our Gospel-Righteousness considered *in esse officii*, as related to, or measured by the Precept, so our Faith and Holiness admit of degrees. Here by Faith and Holiness, you mean the same with that which immediately before you called Gospel-Righteousness, which must needs be meant of Inherent Righteousness. As for those words which you insert, [and that only *quoad materiam præceptam*] I know not well what they mean. For how can *officium*, as related to, and measured by the Precept, be considered but *quoad materiam præceptam?*

1. If I take Holiness (as you say) as opposite to Sin, How do I make all the Actions of the Heathens Holy? Do I make them not sinful? I have ever approved of those Sayings of the Ancients. 37.

Prosp. *de Vocat. Gent.* lib. 1. cap. 7. *Idem in Sentent. ex* Aug. *Sent.* 106. Aug. *contra* Julian. lib. 4. c. 3.

Sine cultu veri Dei, etiam quod virtus videtur esse, peccatum est. And, *Omnis infidelium vita, peccatum est, & nihil est bonum sine summo bono. Ubi enim deest agnitio æterna & incommutabilis veritatis, falsa virtus est, etiam in optimis moribus.* And, *Quicquid boni fit ab homine, & non propter hoc fit, propter quod fieri debere vera sapientia præcipit, & se officio videatur bonum, ipso non recto fine peccatum est.* Scripture also doth carry me that way, namely these places, *Rom.* 8. 8, 9. and *Heb.* 11. 6. I wave that place *Rom.* 14. *ult.* because it seems to look another way; though *Prosper de Vitâ Contempl. lib.* 3. *cap.* 1. doth urge it to this purpose. There is not then the same reason of the Actions of Heathens, as of the Actions of Believers: these are imperfectly holy, the other are altogether unholy.

2. You grant that Holiness is the same with Righteousness, which is opposed to *Reatus Culpæ:* And truly I should think, that Inherent Righteousness is rather *Non-reatus Culpæ*, than *Non-reatus Pœnæ.* For your Parenthesis, [*If any were found, that had any such Righteousness according to the Law of Works*] it is ever granted, That such a perfect Righteousness is not found in any upon Earth; but still it is denyed, that because it is not perfect, therefore it is none at all.

Ad Ctesiphont. *contra* Pelagian.

Justi appellantur (saith *Hierom*, speaking of *Zachary, Elizabeth, Job*, &c.) *non quòd omni vitio careant, sed quòd majori parte virtutum commendentur.* You grant, that Holiness may be denominated from its congruency to the Precept as a Precept. Now this you must grant, may *recipere magis & minus:* for so you grant that Holiness may. And if Congruency, why not Conformity? For Congruency and Conformity, though divers words, yet import (for any thing I see) one and the same thing. I take Faith to be in part our Inherent Righteousness, as it is *Officium*, not as it is *Conditio præviè considerata.*

3. Whether Habitual Faith, or Actual, be properly the Condition of the Covenant, is little to our purpose. And for the thing it self, as I shall grant, that we must not content our selves with a habit of Faith, but must also act Faith: So (I think) you will not deny, that we are *Fideles*, and so justified, even when we sleep, though no act of Faith be performed by us.

You

You say nothing to that which I answered concerning our Divines, of whom you spake, *viz.* That they hold, That the Righteousness whereby we are justified, is not our Personal Righteousness; and therefore though they say, (as you alledge) That our Justification is perfect, and therefore (as you infer) our Righteousness, *viz.* whereby we are justified, must be perfect also; yet all this is little to your purpose. *Ibid.*

2. To what you say, I have said enough before, *viz.* That Faith which is the Condition of the New Covenant, as to Justification, is not our Righteousness whereby we are justified, but only a means to partake of Christ's Satisfaction, the only Righteousness by which we are justified. And for being *rei pœnæ Novæ Legis* for non-performance of its Condition; I say still, I know no punishment of the New Law for want of Faith as its Condition, but only a leaving to the punishment of the Old Law; which punishment yet (I grant) will be so much the more grievous, as the sin, which an Unbeliever, both as an Unbeliever, and otherwise, is guilty of by Gospel-Aggravations, is the more hainous.

1. Tas little doubt but that sincerity of Righteousness doth consist with imperfection of Righteousness, *viz.* Inherent Righteousness, which is really the same with Holiness, how-ever in this or that respect we may distinguish the one from the other. 38.

2. How Hypocrisie can be taken for a seeming or appearing better than we are, yet without affectation or dissimulation, I do not understand. If without any affectation or dissimulation of ours, we seem better than we are, it is another's errour, not our fault; neither can we therefore be called Hypocrites. Your manifold distinctions of Sincerity do serve rather to confound the Reader, than to unfold the matter. I take sincerity to be no distinct Grace, but the *Modus* of other Graces: but why that *Modus* may not admit of degrees, I confess I do not see. I conceive Zeal to be of like nature, yet one may be more or less zealous, and so also more or less sincere. You say here, [There is no *Medium inter Ens & non Ens*] of which I make no doubt but *pag.* 2. you think Relations to be *inter Ens & Nihil*; and what difference between *Nihil & non Ens?* You say, That you have over and over shewed, That Conformity

mity to the Rule of the Condition, doth consist in *indivisibili*. Indeed you have divers times affirmed, That all Conformity is of that nature, but I could never yet see it proved. But why do you now speak of Conformity to the Rule of the Condition? I take Conformity to the Rule of the Precept to be our Personal Righteousness, and the Sincerity of that Conformity to be the Sincerity of this Righteousness. And this Righteousness, though it be sincere, I hold to be imperfect, because the Conformity to the Rule is imperfect. [*Sincerity* (saith Master *Blake*) *is said to be the New Rule, or the Rule of the New Covenant. But this is no Rule, but our Duty, taking the Abstract for the Concrete; Sincerity for sincere walking, and this according to the Rule of the Law, not to reach it, but in all parts to aim at it, and have respect unto it.* Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect to all thy Commandments, *Psal.* 119. 6. *And this is our Inherent Righteousness, which in reference to its Rule* (*N. B.*) *labours under many imperfections*]. And a little before he saith thus, [*I know no other Rule but the Old Rule, the Rule of the Moral Law: that is with me a Rule, a perfect Rule, the only Rule*].

Of the Coven. *chap.* 16. *pag.* 111.

3. It seems very incongruous to grant, that *Apoc.* 22. 11. [*Be holy still*] doth import an encrease of Holiness; and yet to deny, that [*Be righteous still*] doth import an increase of Righteousness. For any thing I know, some on the contrary may as well say, That the latter words import an increase of Righteousness, and yet the other no increase of Holiness. Whereas you speak of varying the sense according to the variety of Subjects, you take it for granted, That here the Subjects are various; whereas both by this, and divers other places before cited, it seems clear to me, that the Subjects, *viz.* Righteousness and Holiness are really the same one with the other. For the *Formale* of Righteousness, what is it but Conformity to the Law, the only Rule of Righteousness? And why such Conformity may not be more or less, I am yet to learn. That place indeed, as many other, speaks of a true Personal Righteousness in the Saints, but yet not of a Perfect Righteousness in them; and consequently not of such a Righteousness, as whereby they are justified, except it be only in some sort, and in some

some measure, which is not the Justification about which we contend. This Imperfect Righteousness is measured by the Law of Works, as a Rule, though it be accepted only by the gracious condescension of the Gospel.

To *Ephes.* 4. 24. you give many Answers, but they seem but so many Evasions. 39.

1. I think there is no Question, but the Apostle speaks by way of Precept and Exhortation. *q. d.* If you have indeed learned Christ, and have been taught by him, you have learned to do so and so; therefore have a care to do so. Surely the Apostles words import a duty required, and so implicitly contain a Precept or Exhortation.

2. That he speaks as well to Believers, True Believers, as mere Professors, is as little to be doubted. For he speaks unto them upon a supposition, that they had learned Christ, and had been taught by him; which though it may belong to mere Professors, yet to true Believers much rather.

3. If the New Man, which is created in Righteousness and Holiness, may encrease, as you grant, then surely Righteousness and Holiness, in which the New Man is created, and without which the New Man is nothing, must increase also. To say, That the New Man may increase in Holiness, but not in Righteousness, is for one that would say any thing, so that he may but δελεάσαι τῇ ὑποθέσει. As well might it be said, That the New Man is created in Holiness, but not in Righteousness.

4. The Form of Righteousness is Conformity to the Law, to which we must labour to conform still more and more, not only *extensivè*, but also *intensivè*.

5. The very conjunction of the words here, as in other places, shews that they are used as ἰσοδυναμοῦντα. Besides, how we should give unto God the things that are God's, and to Men the things that are Mens, and not conform to the Law, which doth prescribe our Duty towards God, and towards Men, I cannot see: and surely Conformity to the Law, is the Righteousness now in question.

1. If we be justified from the Accusation of *Reatus pœnæ primæ Legis propter peccatum*; What need is there of any other justification? [*Upon the Laws Convictions* (saith Mr. *Blake*) *there may follow Gospel-Aggravations; but Conviction is the Work of the Law*]. *Ibid.* Of the Coven. If *c.* 14. *p.* 95.

mity to the Rule of the Condition, doth consist in *indivisibili*. Indeed you have divers times affirmed, That all Conformity is of that nature, but I could never yet see it proved. But why do you now speak of Conformity to the Rule of the Condition? I take Conformity to the Rule of the Precept to be our Personal Righteousness, and the Sincerity of that Conformity to be the Sincerity of this Righteousness. And this Righteousness, though it be sincere, I hold to be imperfect, because the Conformity to the Rule is imperfect. [*Sincerity* (saith Master *Blake*) *is said to be the New Rule, or the Rule of the New Covenant. But this is no Rule, but our Duty, taking the Abstract for the Concrete; Sincerity for sincere walking, and this according to the Rule of the Law, not to reach it, but in all parts to aim at it, and have respect unto it.* Then shall I not be ashamed, when I have respect to all thy Commandments, *Psal.* 119. 6. *And this is our Inherent Righteousness, which in reference to its Rule* (*N. B.*) *labours under many imperfections*]. And a little before he saith thus, [*I know no other Rule but the Old Rule, the Rule of the Moral Law: that is with me a Rule, a perfect Rule, the only Rule*].

Of the Coven. *chap.* 16. *pag.* 111.

3. It seems very incongruous to grant, that *Apoc.* 22. 11. [*Be holy still*] doth import an encrease of Holiness; and yet to deny, that [*Be righteous still*] doth import an increase of Righteousness. For any thing I know, some on the contrary may as well say, That the latter words import an increase of Righteousness, and yet the other no increase of Holiness. Whereas you speak of varying the sense according to the variety of Subjects, you take it for granted, That here the Subjects are various; whereas both by this, and divers other places before cited, it seems clear to me, that the Subjects, *viz.* Righteousness and Holiness are really the same one with the other. For the *Formale* of Righteousness, what is it but Conformity to the Law, the only Rule of Righteousness? And why such Conformity may not be more or less, I am yet to learn. That place indeed, as many other, speaks of a true Personal Righteousness in the Saints, but yet not of a Perfect Righteousness in them; and consequently not of such a Righteousness, as whereby they are justified, except it be only in some sort, and in some

some measure, which is not the Justification about which we contend. This Imperfect Righteousness is measured by the Law of Works, as a Rule, though it be accepted only by the gracious condescension of the Gospel.

To *Ephes.* 4. 24. you give many Answers, but they seem but so many Evasions. 39.

1. I think there is no Question, but the Apostle speaks by way of Precept and Exhortation. *q. d.* If you have indeed learned Christ, and have been taught by him, you have learned to do so and so; therefore have a care to do so. Surely the Apostles words import a duty required, and so implicitly contain a Precept or Exhortation.

2. That he speaks as well to Believers, True Believers, as mere Professors, is as little to be doubted. For he speaks unto them upon a supposition, that they had learned Christ, and had been taught by him; which though it may belong to mere Professors, yet to true Believers much rather.

3. If the New Man, which is created in Righteousness and Holiness, may encrease, as you grant, then surely Righteousness and Holiness, in which the New Man is created, and without which the New Man is nothing, must increase also. To say, That the New Man may increase in Holiness, but not in Righteousness, is for one that would say any thing, so that he may but δικαιοῦν τὴν ἁγιοσύνην. As well might it be said, That the New Man is created in Holiness, but not in Righteousness.

4. The Form of Righteousness is Conformity to the Law, to which we must labour to conform still more and more, not only *extensivè*, but also *intensivè*.

5. The very conjunction of the words here, as in other places, shews that they are used as ἰσοδυναμοῦντα. Besides, how we should give unto God the things that are God's, and to Men the things that are Mens, and not conform to the Law, which doth prescribe our Duty towards God, and towards Men, I cannot see: and surely Conformity to the Law, is the Righteousness now in question.

1. If we be justified from the Accusation of *Reatus pœnæ primæ Legis propter peccatum*; What need is there of any other justification? [*Upon the Laws Convictions* (saith Mr. *Blake*) *there may follow Gospel-Aggravations; but Conviction is the Work of the Law*]. *Ibid.* Of the Coven. If *c.* 14. *p.* 95.

Conviction, then surely Condemnation. If the Law do not condemn, what can? And what can the Law condemn for, but for sin? It is the Law which is the Miniſtration of Condemnation, 2 *Cor.* 3. 9. *By the Law is the knowledg of ſin*, Rom. 3. 20.

2. For the accuſation of *Reatus pœnæ Novæ Legis ob non præſtitam Conditionem*, it is no new Accuſation, but a making good of a former Accuſation; and ſo *Reatus pœnæ Novæ Legis*, is but to be left *in reatu pœnæ Veteris Legis*; ſave that *aggravatâ ex Evangelio culpâ ipſa etiam pœna aggravatur.*

3. I confeſs, I was not before acquainted with theſe two Juſtifications which you ſpeak of: I did not find them in your *Aphoriſms*, but only two ſorts of Righteouſneſs as requiſite to one and the ſame Juſtification, ſo I underſtood it. But truly now that you lay open your conception more than before, I can ſee no ſolidity in it. We are juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt participated by Faith; but not by Faith, as being it ſelf our Righteouſneſs. Faith is indeed required unto Juſtification, yet not as our Righteouſneſs, but as a Condition, Inſtrument, or Means (for I would not ſtrive about words) whereby we partake of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs. I ſee not, that the Scripture doth ſpeak of ſuch a Two-fold Juſtification, one by Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs, another by Faith as our Righteouſneſs; but only of one Juſtification of Chriſt through Faith. *By him all that believe are juſtified*, Acts 13. 39.

Ibid. *Non-reatus pœnæ* is not Inherent Righteouſneſs, of which I expreſly ſpake. I take it to be really the ſame (*p.* 47.) with Holineſs. What you cite therefore out of *Gataker* and *Placæus*, is nothing againſt me, I ſpeaking of Righteouſneſs in one ſenſe, and they in another. Beſides, you ſeem to miſtake the meaning of Mr. *Gataker*'s words: for *Sonnis* as much as *reus culpæ*, and *inſons* as much as *non-reus culpæ*; whereas you ſeem to take *Sons* for *Reus pœnæ*, and *Inſons* for *Non-reus pœnæ*; how-ever his words are not to our purpoſe.

Ibid. 1. I ſee not how either here or elſewhere you infringe that, which I ſaid about the Materiality and Formality, as well of Holineſs as of Righteouſneſs.

2. As Holineſs (you grant) is a Conformity to the Law, as it doth *conſtituere debitum officii*, ſo I conceive

is

is Righteousness, (Inherent I still mean) and not a Conformity to the Rule, as it constituteth, *Conditionem præmii obtinendi, & pœnæ vitandæ, si nimirum secluſâ omni conſideratione officii, Conditio tantùm ut Conditio conſideretur.* (p. 48. *Ibid.* & 40.

1. Acceptance as taken for Accepting * as Righteous, or Accounting just, is (I think) as much as Justifying.

2. I did not (nor I suppose those other Divines by you mentioned) speak so generally, but to presuppose Faith, whereby our Persons are accepted in Christ, and then our Actions. *By Faith* Abel *offered a more excellent Sacrifice*, &c. *Heb.* 11. 4. At length, after many words, which touch not me, in your *6th*, you grant as much as I did, or do desire, *viz.* That *our Persons must be justified and reconciled, before our external Obedience can be accepted.* Whereas you there add, That *it was not as they were an imperfect Conformity to the Law of Works, that* Abel's *Works were accepted*: I answer, It was not indeed by the Law of Works; yet as they were a sincere, though imperfect Conformity to that Law, as a Rule, so they were accepted by the New Covenant. The Law of Works directs, the Covenant of Grace accepts, though we come short of what the Law requires.

* *Justification is by the consent of all men* (*I mean Protestants*) *a remission of our sins, and accepting of us as Righteous*, Mr. *Kendal against* Mr. Goodwin, *cap.* 4. *p.* 138.

[*The Law* (as Mr. *Blake* saith) *still commands us, though the Covenant in Christ, through the abundant Grace of it, upon the terms that it requires and accepts, frees us from the Sentence of it*]. And again, [*A perfection of Sufficiency to attain the end I willingly grant, God condescending through rich Grace to crown weak Obedience. In this sence our Imperfection hath its perfectness; otherwise I must say, That our Inherent Righteousness is an Imperfect Righteousness, in an imperfect Conformity to the Rule of Righteousness*, &c.] He means the Law of Works, which (as before noted) he saith is, *a Rule, a perfect Rule, the only Rule.* Of the Coven. *ch.* 16. *p.* 9, 10. *Ibid. p.* 111, 112.

1. I shall not deny, but that our Faith and Obedience may be said to be justified from the accusation of unsoundness: Yet I think, That this is but a making good of our Justification against the Accusation of being Sinners. For besides that the unsoundness of Faith (and so 40, & 41.

of

of Obedience) is ſin; beſides this (I ſay) if our Faith be not ſound, it is in vain, we are yet in our ſins, we lie under the Curſe and Condemnation of the Law, there being no freedom for us without Faith.

2. I know none that ſay, Our Actions are juſtified through Chriſt's Merit by the Law of Works. For my part I ſhould ſay, We and our Actions are juſtified from the Law of Works, *i. e.* from the condemnation of it, God for Chriſt's ſake accepting us and our Actions, notwithſtanding our imperfection, for which the Law, if we ſhould be ſentenced by it, would condemn us. But here by the way, let me obſerve this, That your retractation of what you ſaid in your *Aphoriſms*, doth ſeem to manifeſt thus much, That when you compoſed thoſe *Aphoriſms*, you either knew not, or liked not that Twofold Juſtification, which now you ſo often ſpeak of, and ſomewhere ſay, That my ignorance in this Point is it, that doth mainly darken all my Diſcourſe. That common ſaying is not always true, Δεῖλ' ἐσθλὸς ἐσθλὰ μηχανᾶται.

For my words; 1. I ſee not why thoſe, [*Acquitting us from all ſin*] ſhould offend you. For you might ſee by what I there ſaid, That I meant the not-imputing of any ſin unto us. And ſo the Phraſes uſed in Scripture, of God, *not remembring our ſins, his covering them, caſting them behind his back, into the bottom of the Sea*, &c. they all import ſuch an acquitting of us from ſin, as I intended; not as if God did account us to be without ſin, which were falſe, but that God doth not charge ſin upon us, *viz.* ſo as to exact ſatisfaction for ſin from us. I meant the very ſame with Mr. *Gataker* in the words which you cited *p.* 30. *Non hoc dicitur, Deum apud ſe judicare, illos pro quorum peccatis univerſis Chriſtus ſatisfecit, nihil mali unquam commiſiſſe, aut boni debiti omiſiſſe; ſed eodem habere loco quoad mortis reatum, & jus ad vitam æternam, ac ſi nihil vel mali admiſiſſent, vel boni debiti omiſiſſent.* Thus Chriſt ſpeaks to the Church, *Cant.* 4. 7. *Thou art all fair, my Love, and there is no ſpot in thee.* What? may ſome ſay, Is there no ſpot in the Church? No, none in her, ſo as to be imputed to her. *Sine maculâ deputatur, quia culpa non imputatur*, as one doth no leſs truly than elegantly expreſs it. You your ſelf yeeld as much as I deſire, or as my words import, *viz.* That God acquitteth

Gilber. ad Loc.

quitteth us from all ſin, ſo as it induceth an obligation to puniſhment.

2. When you ſay, That to acquit us from the Obligation of the Old Law, is one Juſtification, and to juſtifie us againſt the accuſation of being ſo obliged, is another Juſtification; I confeſs (*Davus ſum, non Oedipus*) I do not well underſtand what you mean, for to my apprehenſion theſe are one and the ſame. Me-thinks it muſt needs be, That what doth acquit us from the Obligation of the Old Law, doth alſo *eo nomine* juſtifie us againſt the Accuſation of being ſo obliged. For how are we acquitted from the Obligation, if not juſtified againſt the Accuſation of being obliged?

3. I marvel why you ſhould trouble your ſelf with ſpeaking of the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and of final unbeliet, when as you could not but know, that I ſpake of all ſin, from which we may be juſtified. Why might not one as well quarrel with thoſe words of the Apoſtle, Acts 13. 39. *By him all that believe are juſtified from all things*, &c.

4. I grant the New Covenant not to be violated but by final unbelief, yet (as I expreſly added in that very place which you take hold on) ſo that this be rightly underſtood. For the right underſtanding of it, I ſaid ſomething before; and for further explication, I refer you to Mr. *Blake* of the Covenant, *Chap.* 33.

5. But in the next you do moſt ſtrangely, even without any cauſe that I can ſee, παρεξηγεῖσθαι, and (as they ſay) *fluctus in ſimpulo exeitare*. That [firſt our Perſons, and then our Duties and Actions may properly be ſaid to be juſtified, that is, accepted as juſt, and acquitted from all accuſation brought againſt them, though in themſelves they be not ſuch, but that ſin doth cleave unto them] why ſhould this ſeem ſuch horrid Doctrine, as that your Heart ſhould deteſt it?

1. I ſpeak of good Actions: for it is abſurd to ſay, That evil Actions are accepted as juſt, though we may be ſo accepted notwithſtanding our evil Actions.

2. I plainly ſay, That ſin doth cleave to our good Actions; yet (I ſay) God doth accept them as juſt, notwithſtanding the imperfection of them, and the ſin that doth cleave unto them. If this be offenſive to you, as well (I think) may you be offended at that *Nehem.* 13. 22.

13. 22. *Remember me, O Lord, concerning this, and ſpare me according to the greatneſs of thy Mercy.* And ſo at that 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. *You alſo as lively ſtones are built up a Spiritual Houſe, an Holy Prieſthood, to offer up Spiritual Sacrifices, acceptable unto God through Jeſus Chriſt.* Neither is there any reaſon why thoſe words [*acquitted from all accuſation brought againſt them*] ſhould diſtaſte you. For what though an Accuſation be true, if yet in ſome other reſpect it be of no force? May not they be properly ſaid to be acquitted from all Accuſation, who notwithſtanding the Accuſation, are freed from condemnation? What matter is it how we are accuſed, ſo long as we are ſure not to be condemned? Therefore the Apoſtle uſeth theſe Expreſſions as equipollent, [*Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect?*] and [*Who is he that condemneth?*] Rom. 8. 33, 34. Might you not as vehemently fall upon thoſe words of the Apoſtle, [*Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge,* &c.] as you do upon mine? Might you not ſay, Why? I will lay this, and that, and that, and ten thouſand things beſides to their charge? Yea, but when you have done all you can, to what purpoſe is it? *For who is he that condemneth them, notwithſtanding all the Accuſations brought againſt them?* Theſe very words of the Apoſtle doth *Ameſius* alledg in the former of thoſe Sections which you cite. And if (as you ſay) all may be there fully ſeen in *Ameſius*, that you would ſay in this, then I ſee not that you would ſay any thing againſt me, as indeed you do ſay nothing. But what do you mean by thoſe words, [*and that as to the Law of Works*] which by a Parentheſis you thruſt in among mine? As if I meant, that as well our Actions as our Perſons are accepted as juſt, and acquitted from all condemnation by the Law of Works. Truly I think *tàm quàm*, as well the one as the other, that is indeed neither the one nor the other. The Law doth convince of ſin, and (as much as in it lies) condemn for ſin, both us and our Actions, even the beſt of them: But by the New Covenant, Through Faith in Chriſt we are accepted as juſt, though guilty of manifold ſins; and our Actions are accepted alſo, though full of imperfection. When you ſay, That the *Reatus Culpæ* cannot poſſibly be removed, or remitted, though I think it is but a ſtriving about words, which I do not love, yet

Medull. lib. 1. *c.* 27. §. 20.

I

I cannot assent unto it. For I think it is truly and properly said to be remitted or pardoned; neither doth that seem proper or pertinent, which you add by way of Explication, [that is, *The Man cannot be, or justly esteemed to be a Man that hath not sinned*]. *Quid tum postea?* Cannot therefore the guilt of sin be remitted? Yea, how should sin be remitted, if it were not committed? I think it is as proper to say, *Remittere culpam*, as *Remittere pœnam*. Surely if I may argue from the frequent use of Phrases, and hence infer the propriety of them, as you did, there is nothing more usual in Scripture, (and so in other Writings, and in common Speech) then to say, that Sins, Faults, Offences are remitted. *Grotius* saith, That ἀφιναι, which in Latin is *Remittere*, is as much as *missum facere*; and that the Greek Scholiasts usually expound it by ἀμελεῖν, *i. e.* to neglect, not to regard, to pass over, (as *Prov.* 19. 11. *to pass over a transgression*) and that therefore ἁμαρτήματα ἀφιναι, is *peccata missa facere*, which the Scripture (he saith) following the Metaphor further, calls *peccata in mare projicere*, Mich. 7. 19. It is true, Sin is said to be remitted in reference unto Punishment: *Remittere*, or *missa facere peccata*, (as *Grotius* saith) is as much as *punire nolle*. Yet this hinders not but that sin, or the guilt of sin is properly said to be remitted or pardoned; yea (I think) it doth confirm it. For if it be proper to say, That God will not punish sin, and this is as much as to remit or pardon sin; then it is proper to say, That God doth remit or pardon sin. In a word therefore, my words, about which you make so much adoe, are such as that I see not why any should stumble at them. They do not import, that our Actions, even the best of them, if strictly examined, are not sinful; or that God doth not see any sin in them; but only that God doth pardon and pass by the sinfulness of them, and accept them in Christ, (who is the High-Priest, that doth bear, and so take away the Iniquity of our holy things, *Exod.* 28. 38.) as if they had no sin in them. Neither do I see why you should detest this justifying of our Actions, and yet grant the justifying of our Persons. Your Reasons seem to make as much against the one as against the other. For are not our Persons sinful as well as our Actions? Surely if the Action be sinful, the Person whose Action it is must

De Satisf. pag. 52.

Ibid. p. 53.

must needs be so too. And though you pass over the next, because you reverse your former Assertion, yet in that which I there said, you might have seen enough to vindicate me from all that you have here said against me.

1. You grant what I say.

42. 2. I have said before, That though (in mine Opinion) sin may properly be said to be remitted, yet this is in reference unto punishment.

3. You had no reason to imagine, that I should think, that my Actions, or the Actions of the best upon Earth, can be justified against all Accusations, as if they were absolutely good and perfect; when in that very place I spake of the imperfection and iniquity that is in our best Actions, and how it is through Christ covered, and not imputed unto us. Yea, and immediately I cited divers places of Scripture (*viz. Eccles.* 7. 20. *James* 3. 2. 1 *John* 1. 8, 9. *Job* 9 4. *Exod.* 28. 38.) to prove, that neither our Persons, nor our Actions are so righteous, but that we may be accused of, and condemned for sin in them, and so without the mercy of God in Christ must be. It is strange how you should pass by all this, it being directly before your eyes, and should raise a suspicion, as if I should mean quite contrary.

Ibid. 1. It will not follow that our Persons being once justified by Christ, afterward they may be justified by our Works, when once our Works themselves are all justified in that sense as I explained it, *viz.* That first it is meant only of good Works; and then that God doth not justifie those good Works for their own sake, as if they were fully and perfectly Righteous, but for Christ's sake pardoning and passing by the imperfection that is in them.

De Just. Act. c. 33. *Memb.* 2. *Illud semper retineatur,* (*inquit* Davenantius) *hanc acceptationem operum pendere ex prævia acceptatione personæ in Christo; Cum enim ipsi renati carnem peccatricem adhuc gestent, & opera illorum omnia carnis vitium redoleant, Deus neque ipsos, neque eorum opera grata haberet, nisi & hos & illa in Christo magis quàm in seipsis amplexaretur.* What you say of *Chamier* and others, as being against the meritoriousness of Works merited by Christ, might well have been spared, as being nothing at all against me, who am far from making our Works meritorious, when I make even the best of them

them imperfect, and to need pardon. 2. It is evident by this very Section, to which you now reply, that I ſpake only of good Actions. For how abſurd and ſenſleſs were it to ſay, that our Sins are not fully and perfectly righteous, as I there ſay that our Works are not? The two former Sections alſo clearly ſhew of what Works I ſpake; ſo that here you do but *nodum in ſcirpo quærere*.

1. Aſſerting may well enough be called Confeſſing, though it be that, and ſomewhat more. *Ibid.* 43, & 44.

2. I cannot tell what Judgment ſome others may be of, I ſpeak for my ſelf.

3. I take all ſin to be againſt the Law, as it is diſtinguiſhed from the Goſpel, though ſome ſins may be aggravated by the Goſpel. Of that Law I ſuppoſe St. *John* ſpake, ſaying, *Sin is a tranſgreſſion of the Law*, 1 Joh. 3. 4. And St. *Paul*, *By the Law is the knowledg of ſin*, Rom. 3. 20. And again, *I had not known ſin but by the Law: for I had not know luſt*, (or as the Margent hath it, *concupiſcence*, *viz.* to be ſin) *except the Law had ſaid*, *Thou ſhalt not covet*, Rom. 7. 7. I think it is the common judgment of Divines, that every ſin is againſt ſome of the Ten Commandments.

4. It is no hard matter to conceive how unbelief, and neglect of the Sacraments, &c. are ſins againſt the Precepts of the Decalogue. The firſt precept requires us to have the Lord, and him only, for our God; and ſo to believe whatſoever he doth reval unto us, and to perform whatſoever he doth require of us. The ſecond Precept requires us to Worſhip God as he himſelf doth preſcribe; and conſequently not to neglect any of God's Ordinances; See Mr. *Cawdrey* and Mr. *Palmer* of the Sabbath, *Part.* 2. *Chap.* 4. §. 21, 22, 23. What you add after, makes all for me in this particular, only ſome things ſeem meet to be obſerved.

1. This (I confeſs) to me is ſtrange Philoſophy, That the Earth, of which Man's Body was made, ceaſed not to be Earth ſtill, when it was made Man. As well may you ſay, That *Adam*'s rib, of which *Eve* was formed, ceaſed not to be a Rib ſtill; and ſo that all the Elemenrs retain their ſeveral Natures in all mixt Bodies.

2. *The Precept and Threatning* (you ſay) *are parts of the New Law, though they be common with the Old.*

Here

Here you seem to grant, That nothing is commanded, or threatned in the New Law, which is not commanded or threatned in the Old. Me-thinks then you should not make a Two-fold Righteousness, and a Two-fold Justification; one in respect of the Old Law, another in respect of the New. The Precept [*believe*] belongs to the Old Law; but as it is not only a Precept, but also a Condition, upon performance of which Salvation is promised, [*Believe, and thou shalt be saved*] so it belongs to the New Law. So this Threatning [*If thou dost not believe, thou shalt perish*] belongs to the Old Law, as threatning death for every sin, and consequently for unbelief, which is a sin: and it belongs to the New Law, as leaving an Unbeliever under the condemnation of the Old Law both for that sin of unbelief, and also for all other sins, from the guilt of which he cannot be freed, because he doth not perform the Condition, which the New Law to that end doth require of him. And (as I have before noted) the Condemnation of an Unbeliever is now increased, as his Sin is, by neglecting Salvation offered upon condition of believing.

3. You say, That *the promissory part of the Law of Works doth not oblige*. But your Reason seems invalid, *Quia cessat materia, vel capacitas subjecti*. You mean, no Man can perform the Condition; and so no Man is capable of the Promise made upon that Condition. But why may it not be said, That as the Precept, which is also the Condition, ceaseth not, though none be able to obey it; so the Promise doth remain, though none can enjoy the benefit of it? It may seem unreasonable, that the Threatning should still be in force, and the Promise be quite taken away.

4. You say again, That *the Earth, of which Man's Body was made, doth still retain the form of Earth*; which surely doth need further Explication, or Confirmation, or both.

5. *The threatning of the New Law* (you say) *hath something proper to the New Law:* But for any thing I see, the New Law doth threaten nothing, which the Old Law doth not threaten: though as by the New Law there is an aggravation of sin, so there will be an increase of condemnation.

6. Whereas

6. Whereas you say, that the right stating and clear apprehension of this part, (*viz.* of the difference between the Law and the Gospel, and how far the Law of Works is abrogated) is of greater moment and difficulty by far than my Animadversions take notice of, or than any thing (as to difficulty) that I deal with; truly my desire was, and so is, only to give you some hints for the further clearing of things in the Second Edition of your *Aphorisms*. But if you think, that here in this Section, which is somewhat long, you have sufficiently explicated those Points, I am not of your mind.

1. All that you here say is nothing to my *Animadversion*; only you strive a little about the acceptation of those words [*the Moral Law*]. 44.

2. Neither do I make the Moral Law as taken for the Precept conjunct with the Threatning, a true part of the New Law: yet the Moral Law so taken, being not dissolved or abrogated by the New Law, as you grant, Unbelievers, while they remain such, both for their unbelief, and for their other sins, are under condemnation, as belonging unto them by the Old Law, there being no Remedy provided for them by the New Law; which hath no other threatning, (I think) but that it leaves Unbelievers to the Old Law, and the condemnation of it.

1. I do not dislike your Thesis, [*That Christ died not to satisfie for the violation of the Covenant of Grace*] as you understand it, *viz.* for final unbelief. Yet I hold, That such as profess the Gospel, and live in those sins, which are not consistent with true and sincere Faith, do for the time violate the Covenant of Grace; and for such violation of that Covenant Christ died, or else all such are left without Remedy. I am in this fully of Mr. *Blakes* mind, [*As a wife* (saith he) *by adultery, so they by sin forsake the Covenant, by which they stand betrothed; and by consequence it must needs follow, that Christ died for breach of the Covenant of Grace, as well as for breach of the Covenant of Works; unless we will say, That all Men by name Christians, and found in any of these sins, are in a lost and unrecoverable condition, joyning with those that have said, That there is no Grace or Pardon for those that fall into sin after Baptism. That he died not for their sins, that live and die in final impenitency and unbelief, may be easily gran-*] *Ibid.* & 45. Of the Coven. *chap.* 33.

ted: and that riſes to no more, than that he died not for thoſe, that finally and unrecoverably break Covenant with him].

2. Whereas you confeſs, That for unbelief and impenitency, though it be not final, Men remain *obligati ad pœnam per Legem Naturæ*, but deny it as to the proper Obligation of the New Law; I conceive that the New Law providing no Remedy for them, while they remain ſuch; in this reſpect they are as well by the New Law *obligati ad pœnam* for the time, as final Unbelievers and Impenitents are for ever. You grant the Goſpel doth *non-liberare*, while Men continue in Unbelief; yet you conceive, That it doth not *obligare ad pœnam propriè, viz. ad non-liberationem, & ad pœnam majorem*. Now I conceive that while it doth *non-liberare*, it may be ſaid, *obligare ad non-liberationem*; though I ſhould rather like to ſay, That it doth *relinquere in ſtatu non-liberationis*, and ſo *majoris pœnæ ob contemptum gratiæ, & miſericordiæ oblatæ*. In your Similitude, The Malefactor, whiles he refuſes to come in, and ſubmit to the Terms upon which Pardon is offered, remains in a ſtate of Condemnation, though the ſentence be not executed upon him, except he continue in his refuſal of the offer unto the term prefixed. But you profeſs your ſelf willing to acknowledg, That this *non-liberatio* may in ſome ſort be called *Pœna*; and truly I think, that *Pœna Novæ Legis non alia eſt, quàm non-liberatio à pœnâ veteris Legis; hoc tamen ſemper addito, pœnam veteris Legis, ob neglectum liberationis in Lege Novâ oblatæ, graviorem reddi.*

45. I mean [*Actually in the ſtate of Damnation*] and you grant as much as I deſire, *viz.* That they are obliged even for that ſin unto death, *per Legem Naturæ, & non liberati per Legem Gratiæ*. Why then ſhould you deny, that they are actually obliged to Damnation? Will you put a difference between Death and Damnation? Or betwixt obliged, and actually obliged? *He that believeth not, is condemned already*, John 3 18. therefore he is actually under condemnation, and ſo remains, as long as he remains in unbelief; *The Wrath of God abideth on him*, John 3. 36. That the Sentence is not yet executed, but upon believing he may be freed from the execution of it, is another thing.

The

The Parentheſis, which you ſay, is wanting in your *Aphoriſms*, might help to make the words more clear; as they ſtand, they ſeem obſcure: which is all that I would have obſerved. *Ibid.*

Neither am I willing to fall upon either Logical or Philoſophical Diſputes; yet I am alſo unwilling to recede from received Opinions, except I ſee urgent cauſe for it. Now that an Accident muſt have a Subject to exiſt in, as it is generally held, ſo I am perſwaded it is true. *Burgerſdicius* (whoſe authority I may well enough oppoſe to *Scheiblers*) ſaith, *Accidens eſt Ens ſubſtantiæ inhærens.* Indeed he ſaith, *Relationes non tam inhærent alicui ſubjecto, quàm adhærent:* but he doth not deny that they do *inhærere.* For he ſaith, *Relatio ejuſmodi accidens eſt, quod non tantùm (N. B.) in aliquo eſt, ut in ſubjecto, ſed refertur etiam ad aliud.* It is uſually one Argument which our Divines have againſt Tranſubſtantiation, that thereby Accidents are made to exiſt without a Subject. *Scheibler* grants, that an Accident hath not exiſtence by it ſelf, that it is not ἀυθυπόστατον, (ſo it ſhould be, not ἀυθυπόστατον). Now every thing that hath Exiſtence, muſt (I think) either exiſt by it ſelf, or in ſome other thing. *Ibid.* & 46. *Logic.* lib. 1 cap. 7.

2. *Adjunctum & Subjectum*, and *Effectum & Cauſa*, are not ſo contradiſtinct, but that the ſame thing may be *Adjunctum & Effectum*, and ſo the ſame thing *Subjectum & Cauſa.*

3. Whereas *Scheibler* ſaith, *Actio tranſiens nullum habet ſubjectum, ne quidem ipſum Patiens, ut viſum eſt*; I ſay, *Ego illud nondum vidi, nec vel verum, vel verisimile mihi videtur.* I think, *Omnis Actio ſubjectatur in Patiente:* and this I hold to be true even of Inmanent Actions, which though they have the Agent for the Subject, yet it is becauſe the Agent is there alſo the Patient; and it is not *quà Agens*, but *quà Patiens*, that it is the ſubject of the Action. See Mr. *Kendal* againſt Mr. *Goodwin*, *chap.* 4. *p.* 135.

4. He argues thus, *Actio ut ſic non dicit niſi egreſſum à virtute activâ alicujus Agentis. Egreſſus autem opponitur ne eſſe in. Reſp.* 1. *Actio ut ſic neceſſario infert Paſſionem. Fieri enim non poteſt, ut aliquid agat, niſi etiam aliquid patiatur. Ergo Actio non tantum dicit egreſſum à virtute activâ, verùm etiam infert receptionem in Patiente.* 2. *Actio & Paſſio ſunt idem motus;*

metus ; ſed Actio vocatur quatenus ab Agente procedit, Paſſio autem quatenus in Patiente recipitur. Etiamſi igitur Actio & Paſſio formaliter differant, cum tamen realiter idem ſint, ſi Paſſio eſt in ſubjecto, Actionem etiam in ſubjecto eſſe neceſſe eſt.

5. Whereas you doubt whether *Scotus* be not right in holding that Immanent Acts are in the Predicament of Quality, that (as divers other Paſſages) doth ſhew that you are much inclined to that which doth croſs the common Opinion ; which ſurely is in it ſelf very dangerous, though (I know) you are prudent and ſober-minded, ſo that there is little cauſe of fear this way in reſpect of you. Yet wanton Wits, and unſtable Spirits, may extend your Notions further than you intended them ; and therefore, eſpecially conſidering the times into which we are faln, you have need to be wary : but *dictum ſapienti ſat eſt.*

46. See Mr. *Kendal* againſt Mr. *Goodwin*, chap. 4. p. 130, 131. *Ibid.*

Though we cannot know God to Perfection, yet we may and muſt know him ſo, as to remove from him all Imperfection, and conſequently all compoſition. The more ſimple any thing is, *cæteris paribus*, the more perfect it is : Therefore God being moſt Perfect, he is moſt Simple.

This contains only a Logical Diſpute about the Predicaments and Relations. Now for the Predicaments, though I do not ſay that they all note real Beings diſtinct one from another, ſo Action and Paſſion do not ; yet I think they all note real Beings, *i. e.* Beings which are not meerly rational or imaginary. And how you ſhould queſtion this, eſpecially of Subſtance, Quantity and Quality, (which are more than two) I cannot conceive. And for Relations, hear *Aquinas*, whoſe judgment (beſides that he giveth reaſon for what he ſaith) with me is of far more weight than of your late Authors. Part. 1. Queſt. 13. Art. 7. *in Corp.* *Quidam poſuerunt Relationem non eſſe rem naturæ, ſed rationis tantùm. Quod quidem apparet eſſe falſum ex hoc, quòd ipſæ res naturales ordinem & habitudinem habent ad invicem.* Yet as there are *Entia Rationis*, ſo there are *Relationes Rationis*. Yea, *Aquinas* ſhews, *Ibid.* & Vide. *ibid. ad* 2. & *ad* 4. that *Quædam Relationis ſunt quantum ad utrumque extremum res naturæ*, &c. *Quandoque verò in uno extremo eſt res naturæ, & in altero extremo eſt res rationis tantùm, nempe cum duo extrema non ſunt ejuſdem ordinis,*

dinis, &c. And of this latter sort he notes the Relations are, which are betwixt God and the Creatures. *Cum igitur (inquit) Deus sit extra totum ordinem creaturæ, & omnes creaturæ ordinentur ad ipsum, & non è converso, manifestum est, quòd creaturæ realiter referuntur ad Deum, sed in Deo non est aliqua realis relatio ad creaturas, sed secundum rationem tantùm, in quantum creaturæ referuntur ad ipsum. Et sic nihil prohibet hujusmodi nomina importantia relationem ad creaturam, prædicari de Deo ex tempore, non propter mutationem aliquam ipsius, sed propter creaturæ mutationem, sicut columna fit dextra animali, nullâ mutatione circa ipsam existente, sed animali translato.* And again, *Creatio (inquit) activè considerata significat actionem divinam, quæ est ejus essentia cum relatione ad creaturam. Sed relatio in Deo ad creaturam non est realis, sed secundum rationem tantùm: relatio verò creaturæ ad Deum est realis*, &c. *Aquin.* Part 1. Quæst. 45 Art. 3. Ad 1.

Heereboord, p. 179. saith, *Pater non significat aliquid, quod humanæ naturæ propriè & per se insit, sed quomodo ille, qui sic dicitur, se habeat ad filium.* Resp. *Pater est Relatum, nempe Substantia cum Relatione ad aliud: Paternitas est Relatio, & inest subjecto, nempe homini, qui est Pater. Quod* p. 184. *dicit Relationem esse medium inter Ens reale & Nihil, id tantum dicit, non probat.*

You say, That however you are confident, that Relation is not *verè Ens*; yet you will not say, that it is *Nihil* or *Non Ens*; and you said before, (as I noted, and it is most sure) *Inter Ens & non Ens non datur medium.* The distinction of *Medium Participationis*, & *Medium Negationis* will not here serve. For certainly *Contradictoriâ non admittunt medium Negationis. Aut Homo, aut non Homo: aut Ens, aut non Ens: non datur medium.* The Authors to which you refer me, I have not, save only Dr. *Twisse*; but he is of another Edition, *viz.* in *Folio*, so that I cannot find the place, as you cite it.

1. He that is justified, is so freed from all condemnation, that he is liable to no condemnation, *Rom.* 8. 1, 33, 34. And he that is so freed, is perfectly freed, and consequently perfectly justified, though the freedom from condemnation, and so the justification be not so fully and *Ibid.* & 47, 48, 49.

perfectly made manifeſt as it ſhall be. The freedom from condemnation *per ſententiam Judicis*, of which you ſpeak, doth not add to the freedom it ſelf, but only to the manifeſtation of it. The Sentence is indeed paſt already, *John* 3. 18. though it be not ſo ſolemnly pronounced, as it ſhall be.

2. He that is freed from all Condemnation, is certainly freed from all Accuſation, ſo as that no Accuſation can be prejudicial to him; though he may be accuſed, yet it matters not, ſeeing he cannot be condemned. Elſe the Apoſtle had triumphed before the Victory, ſaying, *Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge*, &c. *Who is he that condemneth*? Rom. 8. 33, 34.

3. The Apoſtle doth not only ſay, *There is no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Jeſus*, Rom. 8. 1. but alſo, *Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect*? v. 33. *viz.* when they are in Chriſt, and ſo juſtified. Which in effect is as much, as if it were ſaid, There ſhall be no condemnation to ſuch. But you grant, That other Texts ſpeak as much, and that ſuch neither now are, nor ever ſhall be under condemnation. Yet you ſay, That they would be to morrow condemned, if no more were done than is done. You mean (I ſuppoſe) if they did not renew the Act of Faith: but (I ſay, and you grant it) they who are once juſtified, though they ſin daily, yea, and may lie long in ſin, as *David* did, yet they ſhall renew the Act of Faith, and have the joy of God's Salvation reſtored unto them, as he prayed, *Pſal.* 51. 12. Neither is there any interciſion of Juſtification, though there may be a privation of the joy and comfort of it.

To your Objections, I anſwer, *Ad* 1. He that is once juſtified, can contract no guilt ſo as to fall from his Juſtification. Beſides, when I ſpake of Juſtification being perfect, I only mean, That a Juſtified Perſon is juſtified, not in part only, but fully, *i. e.* from all ſins which at preſent he is guilty of: not but that his Juſtification hath need to be renewed in reſpect of new ſins; and ſo his Juſtification may be ſaid to increaſe *extenſivè*, as extending to more and more ſins, as they are increaſed more and more. But that in this reſpect we ſhall be more fully juſtified at the laſt Judgment than we are now, is

but

but by accident, and not from the Nature or Essence of Justification.

Ad 2. Justification *per Sententiam Judicis, & Sententiam magis publicam*, makes (as I said) but for the more full and perfect manifestation of it. *In die judicii* (*inquit* Maccovius) *Christus non tam justificaturus* (*N. B.*) *est credentes, quàm declaraturus est ex operibus eorum, eos credidisse in hâc vitâ, & justificatos fuisse.* Thus undoubtedly is that to be understood in *Acts* 3. 19. For without question no sins shall then (at the last Judgment) be blotted out, which were not blotted out before: but the blotting of them out shall then more fully appear than before. *In resurrectione à mortuis*, (*inquit* Rainoldus *noster*) *Christus, qui venet judicatum vivos & mortuos, quemadmodum ipse pronunciat, ea quæ ligaverint ipsius ministri, ligatum iri in cœlis, ita quæ priùs in terrâ remissa fuerint, confirmabit ipse suâ sententiâ, ut remissa & deleta in æternum, omnia nimirum fidelium & sanctorum peccata. Quare quacunque, & quorumcunque peccata remissa fuerint in hoc seculo, etiam in futuro seculo remittentur, quoniam autem peccata non fuerint remissa in hoc seculo, non remittentur in futuro, nempe peccata hominum incredulorum & impiorum.* Petrus, Act. 3. *hoc locupletissimè confirmavit.—Resipiscite* (*inquit*) *ut deleantur peccata vestra, postquam venerint tempora refrigerationis, &c.* —— *Nostri cum affirmant peccata non remitti in futuro seculo, sed in isto tantum, negant id quod astruunt Pontificii, peccata remissum iri in futuro seculo, quæ in præsenti non remittebantur. Nam Christus confirmabit sententiam suam, quam priùs tulit, cum feret sententiam illam novissimam in ultimo judicio. Itaque peccata nulla tum remittentur, nisi quæ quisque testimonio conscientiæ suæ hîc percipit remissa esse in presenti seculo.* —Certè ipse (Bellarminus) *agnovit, vel agnoscere potuit è verbis* Calvini *quæ citat, nos hoc judicio esse, præsertim in eo ipso loco* Calvini *quem citat, ubi ait* Calvinus, *Christum* (Mat. 12. 32.) *hâc partitione usum esse, quâ judicium complexus est, quod sentit in hâc vitâ uniuscujusque conscientia, & postremum illud, quod palam* (*N. B.*) *in resurrectione feretur.* For *peccata futura*, which you also here speak of, I have said enough in answer to the former Objection. And you

De Justif. Disp. 7.

De Libr. Apocryph. Prælect. 171.

* *Instit. lib.* 3. *c.* 1. §. 7.

may ſee much more to this purpoſe in the Account given to the Parliament by the Miniſters which they ſent to *Oxford*, p. 7, 8, 9.

Ad 3. Caſtigatory Puniſhment is no part of that Condemnation, from which we are freed by Juſtification, but a means to preſerve us from falling into Condemnation, ſee 1 *Cor.* 11. 32.

Ad 4. Though the continuance of our Juſtification here be conditional, *viz.* upon condition of the continuance of our Faith, yet the continuance of the Condition being certain, ſo alſo is the continuance of our Juſtification. There is not the like reaſon of Predeſtination, which is only a decreeing of what God will do for us; but God juſtifieth (as you ſay) *pro præſenti*; and whom he once juſtifieth, he will always juſtifie; elſe the Apoſtle would not ſay, *Whom he juſtified, them he alſo glorified*, Rom. 8. 30. Though Means muſt be uſed, and Conditions performed for the continuation and conſummation of our Juſtification; yet it being certain that the Means ſhall be uſed, and the Conditions performed, it is alſo certain that our Juſtification ſhall be continued and conſummated.

Here perhaps you may take hold of what I ſay, and object, It ſhall be conſummated; therefore as yet it is not conſummated.

Anſw. It is not (I grant) in reſpect of the full enjoyment of the Benefits belonging to Juſtified Perſons: but it is already conſummated; * ſo that they have a full right to the enjoyment of thoſe Benefits. Therefore the Apoſtle ſpeaks as of a thing already done, *Whom he juſtified, them he alſo glorified:* ſee alſo *Rom.* 5. 1, 2.

* *Juſtificatio nullum locũ relinquit condemnationi.* Joh. 5. 24. *Et vitam æternam certò & immediatè adjudicat.* Ames. *Medul. lib.* 1. *cap.* 27. §. 23.

Ad 5. If by this, [*the ſolemnizing of all is wanting*] you mean, That yet there wants the manifeſtation of our Juſtification, it hinders not but that our Juſtification is already perfect, though it be not ſo perfectly made manifeſt as hereafter it ſhall be. So if by [*Marriage not ſolemnized*] you mean a Marriage not publickly celebrated, I ſee not but that a Marriage privately celebrated may be in it ſelf as perfect as the other. But it ſeems ſtrange, that you ſhould think, that we ſhould ſcarce be called Juſtified

ed now, but in reference to Justification at the last Judgment; when-as both Scripture and Divines usually speak of Justification as a thing that we are here actually partakers of. What you say of Mr. *Lawson*, as if he held, That Justification here is but a right to Justification hereafter, I much wonder at: His Reasons I know not, but if that be his Opinion, the whole current of Scripture, and the general consent of Divines (I think) is against him. Whereas you call the solemn pronouncing of Sentence at the last day, Sentential Justification, I should rather call it, Publick Sentential Justification, or a publick manifestation of the Sentence of Justification. For surely our Justification here is * Sentential. God doth now pronounce and sentence Believers Just and Righteous, though not in that clear and evident manner as he will at the Last Judgment. Neither do I think that our Divines commonly using the word [*Justification*] for Justification (as you say) by Sentence, do understand it of the Sentence at the last Day, but of the Sentence whereby God doth now justifie those that believe.

* See the *Oxford* account, *p.* 7. and *Amesius Med. lib.* 1. *cap.* 27.

Perhaps you will say, Where is that Sentence?

Answ. It is in the Scripture. But (you may say) The Scripture speaks only in general. Well, but if God in the Scripture say, That *all that believe are justified*, as *Acts* 13. 39. then consequently he saith, That you and I believing, are justified. And this Sentence God by his Spirit doth bring home to Believers in particular; though it is true, they have not that clear evidence and full assurance, as they shall have hereafter. So for Condemnation at the last day, I think it to be but a more solemn and publick pronouncing of the Sentence, together with the immediate and full execution of it. For otherwise the Sentence is past already, *He that believeth not, is condemned already*, John 3. 18. I do not deny, that Declarative Justification at the last Judgment, is properly Justification; only I think it is the same Justification which Believers here have, though it shall then be more fully manifested than now it is. That which you speak of Justification being more full at death than before, only shews that it is more full *Extensivè*, as freeing from the guilt of more sins: but that is only *per accidens*; Justification in it self considered, was as perfect before: for it freed from all sin, and from all Condemnation, and the other doth no more.

What

50. What the meaning of your Queſtion was, [*If we be not one real Perſon with Chriſt, then one what?*] I could not tell: but the words did ſeem to imply, That we muſt either be one real Perſon with Chriſt, or elſe we could not any way be one with him; whereas the Scripture is clear, that Believers are one with Chriſt, though that they are one real Perſon with him, is not to be admitted. Therefore I thought meet to anſwer as I did, *viz.* That we are *one Spirit*, as the Apoſtle expreſſeth it, 1 *Cor.* 6. 17. that is, ſpiritually one with Chriſt, as being partakers of one and the ſame Spirit with him. No doubt but further Queries may ſtill be made: and who is able to clear all Difficulties that do occur in matters of this nature? Yet I ſee not why we ſhould not content our ſelves with thoſe Similitudes and Reſemblances, which the Scripture doth uſe to illuſtrate this Myſtery, as of the *Vine* and *Branches*, Joh. 15. and of the *Head* and *Members*, Epheſ. 5.

Ibid. To your next Section I need ſay no more than this, *Non oportet litigare de verbis, cum de re conſtet.*

Ibid. & 51. I have ſhewed my meaning all along, *viz.* That Chriſt's Satisfaction, and not Faith, is properly that by which we are juſtified. Whereas you ſay, [*We are juſtified by Faith it ſelf, as the Condition, and not ſo by Chriſt*] I can admit it only thus, That Faith is the Condition required of us, that ſo we may be juſtified by Chriſt. Otherwiſe I cannot yeeld, that the performing of the Condition required of us unto Juſtification, is properly that by which we are juſtified; but of that enough before. For the Habit and Act of Faith, I little doubt but that Habits and Acts are of a different nature. For Habits may be in us when we ſleep, or otherwiſe do not act and exerciſe thoſe Habits. I think alſo, that though acquired Habits follow Acts, yet infuſed Habits (ſuch as Faith is) go before.

2. The Act of Faith being the receiving of Chriſt, I ſee not how any can make the Act of Faith, but the Habit to be the Inſtrument of receiving Chriſt. And if any of our Divines ſay, That it is not the Habit of Faith, but the Act that doth juſtifie; I think they mean, that Faith doth juſtifie as acting, *i. e.* receiving Chriſt. So that they do not deny the Habit of Faith to juſtifie, yea, they make it the inſtrumental cauſe of Juſtification; only they make

make the Act of Faith requisite unto Justification. The Similitude betwixt the Hand and Faith is to the purpose, though they differ as you say. No Similitude is to be set on the Rack: if it seem to illustrate that for which it is used, it is sufficient. But except you speak of the supernatural perfection of the Soul, I see not how Faith is the perfection of it. For the Soul hath its natural perfection without Faith, or any other Habit. Whereas you labour much to prove, that the Habit of Faith is not properly an Instrument, I think you trouble your self to no purpose, though (I know) you have some end in it. But what if it be not an Instrument properly, if yet it may not unfitly be so termed? And for any thing I see, it may, even as generally Divines do so term it.

Fides (saith *Rivet*) *est velut organum; & manus animæ, quâ beneficia oblata acceptantur.* And again, *Videndum est quodnam sit animæ organum hanc remissionem apprehendens —Id fidei exclusivè tribuendum*, &c. *Disp. de Fide Just.* §. 17, 18.

So *Trelcatius Jun. Ex parte hominis, Justificationis passivæ causa efficiens est ac dicitur reductivè, tota est Instrumentalis, & Fides est*, &c. *Instit. lib. 2. de Justif.*

Thus also *Calvin, Fides Instrumentum est duntaxat percipiendæ justitiæ.* Inst. *lib.* 3. *cap.* 11. §. 7.

And *Wotton, Ex efficientibus Justificationis causis reliqua est Fides, quam Instrumenti locum obtinere diximus.* And again, *Nec illud quidem cujusquam est momenti, quod Instrumenti nomine nusquam in Scripturis* (*Fides*) *insigniatur. Nam nec Causa esse dicitur, cujus tamen rationem obtinere, Theologi omnes confitentur.* *De Recon.* p. 1. l. 2. c. 18 *Ibid.* p. 2. l. 2. c. 6.

And *Bellarmine* saying, that *Luther* makes Faith *Formalem causam Justificationis*; *Davenant* answers, *Instrumentalem semper agnoscit, non autem formalem*, &c. *De Just. Habit.* cap. 22.

Pemble saith, [*Faith doth justifie Relatively and Instrumentally*]. Of Justif. §. 2 *chap.* 1. *p.* 27.

So Mr. *Ball* of Faith, *chap.* 10. *pag.* 135. [*It is a cause only Instrumental*, &c.]

And of the Covenant, *chap.* 3. *p.* 19. [*Faith is a necessary and lively Instrument of Justification*, &c. *If it be demanded whose Instrument it is? It is the Instrument of the Soul*, &c.] See *Hemingius* as here cited, *p.* 95.

Mr.

Of the Coven. c. 12. p. 80. Mr. *Blake's* words (I think) do more nearly concern you. [*And these things considered, I am truly sorry, that Faith should now be denied to have the office and place of an Instrument in our Justification; nay, scarce be allowed to be called the Instrument of receiving Christ that justifies us*, &c.] And having cited *Acts* 18. 26. *Ibid.* pag. 81. *Ephes.* 3. 17. & *Gal.* 3. 14. he saith, [*These Scriptures speak of Faith as the Souls Instrument to receive Christ Jesus*, &c.] See there much more to this purpose.

Of Justif. c. 7. p. 90. I will add to these one more, *viz. J. Goodwin*, who though in divers things he be ctosse and contrary to our Divines, yet in this, at least in words, he doth comply with them, professing to hold, That *Faith doth justifie instrumentally.*

If the propriety of Words must always be strictly examined, we shall scarce know how to speak: It is well if we can find words, whereby to express our selves so as that others may understand (if they please) what we mean. All that our Divines mean, when they speak of Faith justifying Instrumentally, or as an Instrument, I suppose, is this, and so much also they usually express, That Faith doth not justifie absolutely, or in respect of it self, but Relatively in respect of its Object, Christ and his Righteousness laid hold on and received by Faith. Neither should you (me-thinks) strive about the word [*Receiving*] how it should be the Act of Faith. It sufficeth, That the Scripture makes Believing in Christ, and Receiving of Christ, one and the same, *John* 1. 12. That which you say of our most famous Writers ordinarily laying the main stress of the Reformed Cause and Doctrine on a plain Error, did deserve to have been either further manifested, or quite concealed; to me it seems very injurious both to our most famous Writers, and also to the Reformed Cause and Doctrine.

52. My meaning is, That Faith justifieth, as it apprehendeth and receiveth Christ, whom the Gospel doth give for Righteousness to such as receive him, *i. e.* believe in him. And thus our Divines frequently express themselves.

Luther, *Fides justificat, quia apprehendit, & possidet illum thesaurum, scil. Christum presentem. Loc. Com. Class. 2. loc. 19. ex tom. 4.* And again, *Fides non tanquam opus justificat, sed ideò justificat, quia apprehendit mi-*

misericordiam in Christo exhibitam. Ibid. ex tom. 1. *in Gen.*

So *Calvin*, *Quod objicit* (*nempe* Osiander) *vim justificandi non ineſſe fidei ex ſeipsâ, ſed quatenus Chriſtum recipit, libenter admitto.* —*Fides inſtrumentum eſt duntaxat percipiendæ juſtitiæ.* *Inſt. lib.* 3. *cap.* 11. § 7

Thus alſo *Hemingius*, *Juſtificamur autem fide, non quòd fides ea res ſit, quâ juſti ſumus, ſed quia eſt Inſtrumentum, quo Chriſtum apprehendimus, & complectimur.* *De Juſtif. pag. mihi* 141.

Davenant, *Hoc neceſſario intelligendum eſt, quatenus ſuum objectum apprehendit, & credenti applicat, nempe Chriſtum cum ſalutiferâ ejus juſtitiâ.* And again, *Quî igitur Fides apprehendit, & applicat nobis Chriſti juſtitiam? id fidei ipſi tribuitur, quod reapſe Chriſto debetur.* *De Juſt. Hab. cap.* 28. *Arg. & Ibid.*

Ames. *Dolor ac deteſtatio peccati non poteſt eſſe cauſa juſtificans, quia non habet* (*N. B.*) *vim applicandi nobis juſtitiam Chriſti.* And again, *Apprehenſio juſtificationis per veram fiduciam, non eſt ſimpliciter per modum objecti, ſed per modum objecti* (*N. B.*) *nobis donati. Quod enim Deus donaverit fidelibus Chriſtum, & omnia cum eo, Scriptura diſertis verbis teſtatur*, Rom. 8. 32. *Hic tamen obſervandum eſt, accuratè loquendo, apprehenſionem Chriſti & juſtitiæ ejus, eſſe fidem juſtificantem, quia juſtificatio noſtra exurgit ex apprehenſione Chriſti, & apprehenſio juſtificationis, ut poſſeſſionis noſtræ præſentis, fructus eſt, & effectum apprehenſionis prioris.* *Contra Bell. Tom.* 4. *lib.* 5. *c.* 4 § 5. *Ibid.* § 11.

Pemble, [*We deny that Faith juſtifies us as it is a Work*, &c. *It juſtifies us only as the Condition required of us, and an Inſtrument of embracing Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; nor can the contrary be proved*]. Of Juſtif. § 2. *ch.* 3. *pag.* 61.

Mr. *Ball*, [*When Juſtification and Life is ſaid to be by Faith, it is manifeſtly ſignified, That Faith receiving the Promiſe, doth receive Righteouſneſs and Life freely promiſed*]. Of the Coven. *chap.* 3. *pag.* 19.

Mr. *Blake*, [*Faith as an Inſtrument receives Righteouſneſs unto Juſtification*]. Of the Coven. *chap.* 12. *pag.* 82.

If you agree with me (as you ſay) in this particular, you will agree alſo with theſe whom I have cited, for I agree with them; their meaning and mine (ſo far as I

can

can discern) is the same. See also Mr. *Ball* of Faith, *Part* 1. *chap.* 10. *pag.* 135.

Ibid. For the Twofold Righteousness, which you make necessary unto Justification, I think also I have said enough before. But seeing that in the place, on which I made the *Animadversion*, you mention it as a Reason why Faith must justifie in a proper sense, and not Christ's Righteousness only, I cannot but observe how that acute and learned Man Mr. *Pemble* doth argue the quite contrary way, *viz.* That Faith doth not justifie, as taken properly, because then we should be justified by a Two-fold Righteousness. [*We are not justified* (saith he) *by two Righteousnesses existing in two divers Subjects; But if we be justified by the Work of Faith, we shall be justified partly by that Righteousness which is in us*, viz. *of Faith, and partly by the Righteousness of Christ without us*]. And again, [*We cannot be properly justified by both, for our own Faith, and Christ's obedience too. For if we be perfectly just in God's sight for our own Faith, what needs the imputation of Christ's Obedience to make us just? If for Christ's Righteousness we be perfectly justified, How can God account us perfectly just for our Faith?*]

Of Justif. §. 2. cap. 2. pag. 39.

Ibid. pag. 40.

Ibid. & 53. 1. If you do not oppose the Literal sense of Scripture to Figurative, I do not oppose you, but grant that Faith doth justifie figuratively, *viz.* as apprehending Christ by whom we are justified.

Ubi supra. [*In these places* (saith *Pemble*) *where it is said, Faith is imputed for Righteousness, the Phrase is to be expounded* Metonymice, i. e. *Christ's Righteousness believed on by Faith, is imputed to the Believer for Righteousness*].

A figurative sense may be a plain sense, yet it is not a proper sense; for surely Figurative and Proper are opposite one to the other.

In Gen. Exer. 73. *Distinguendum est* (*inquit* Rivetus) *inter has phrases, quæ etsi in unum sensum conveniunt, differunt nihilominùs in eo, quòd una est figurata, altera propria. Figurata est, Fides imputatur ad justitiam. Propria est, Justitia imputatur credenti. Tum enim justitiæ nomen ponitur directè pro eâ justitiâ, cujus intuitu Deus erga nos placatus est, & pro justis habet. In primo autem Fidei tribuitur, quod ejus non est propriè sumpta. Nec enim*

enim est justitia, nec justitiæ loco habetur, sed objectum ejus est justitia vera, quæ per fidem nobis imputatur, ut pro nostra habeatur, quam credendo amplexi sumus. Hæc si capere nolint aut veteratores Romani, *aut Novatores* Sociniani, *sufficiat nobis Apostolos autores habere, qui operibus nostris, ergò fidei quâ opus, omnem justitiæ laudem detrahunt, eamque in justitiâ, quæ sine operibus nobis imputatur, constituunt.* That the sense by me and others put on Scripture is forced, you affirm, but prove not.

2. I acknowledg but one Righteousness by which we are justified, *viz.* the Righteousness of Christ through Faith imputed unto us; see *Rom.* 5. 18. Your Similitude makes against you. For our Hands and Teeth are but Instruments whereby we are fed: so our Faith is but an Instrument whereby we are justified. And mark here, how you can use the Comparison your self, which yet you dislike when others use it. But doth the Scripture no where say, That Christ or his Righteousness is imputed unto us for Righteousness? Doth not the Scripture call Christ *our Righteousness*? Jer. 23. 6. Doth it not say, That *Christ is the end of the Law for Righteousness to every one that believeth*? Rom. 10. 4. Is not this as much as if it were said, That Christ or his Righteousness is imputed unto us for Righteousness? See also *Rom.* 5. 18, 19. and 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult.*

What Mr. *Gataker* saith concerning this Point, not having the Book which I suppose you mean, (his *Defence of Wotton*) I cannot tell: What *Wotton* and *J. Goodwin* say, I see, but am not satisfied with it. *Maccovius de Justif.* in divers Disputations doth professedly oppose *Wotton*, and answers his Objections. If you had urged any of his, or the others Arguments, I should have taken them into consideration; but seeing you do not, it is enough (I think) to oppose their authority, with the Authority of others no way inferiour unto them.

Davenant, *Scripturæ, quæ asserunt ipsam fidem nobis imputari ad justitiam, apertè indicant Christi justitiam credentibus imputari. Nam fides, qualitas in se consideratæ, non potest magis imputari ad justitiam, quàm aliæ qualitates ab eodem Spiritu infusæ: sed hoc necessariò intelligendum est, quatenus suum objectum apprehendit, & credenti applicat, nempe Christum cum salutiferâ* De Just. Habit. cap. 28. Arg. 8.

ejus

ejus justitiâ. Among other Scriptures which he cites to this purpose, that is one, which you ſtand ſo much upon, [Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs*]. *Ex hiſce* (*inquit*) *nos colligimus, imputari credentibus Chriſti juſtitiam, quando illam verâ fide apprehendunt.*

And *Bellarmine* objecting, *Ipſa fides imputatur ad juſtitiam: fides autem non eſt imputata Chriſti juſtitia, ſed qualitas in nobis inhærens.* He anſwers, *Frivola eſt Objectio: nam nihil uſitatius, quàm cauſa applicanti illud tribuere, quod propriè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam. Quia igitur fides apprehendit & applicat nobis juſtitiam Chriſti; id fidei ipſi tribuitur, quod reapſe Chriſto debetur.*

Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. Lib. 6. cap. 1.

So *Ames.* anſwering the very ſame words of *Bellarmine*, ſaith, *Fides imputatur ad juſtitiam*, Rom. 4. 5. *idem eſt cum eo quod dicitur*, v. 6. *Deus imputat juſtitiam abſque operibus*; & *remittit peccata*, v. 7. *Fides autem ipſa abſolutè conſiderata, neque eſt juſtitia ſine opere, neque remiſſio peccatorum: neceſſe eſt igitur, ut fides imputata relativè involvat ſuum objectum, id eſt, Chriſtum fide apprehenſum.*

Loc. com. de Juſtif. Loc. 31. Quæſt. 35.

Bucan. *Quomodo igitur fides dicitur in juſtitiam imputari? Non abſolutè, ſed relativè, &c.* And having cited *Rom.* 3. 22, 25. he ſaith, *Quibus locis Fidei voce* (*metonymia continentis pro re contentâ*) *Chriſtus crucifixus intelligitur, ſed fide apprehenſus. Hoc ſenſu fides Abrahæ imputata eſt ei ad juſtitiam, ſeu pro juſtitiâ*, Rom. 4. 9. *Et fides cuilibet credenti imputatur ad juſtitiam, i. e. Chriſtus crucifixus apprehenſus fide cenſetur noſtra juſtitia; cenſetur, inquam, à Deo è tribunali ſuo ſententiam juſtitiæ pronunciante. Quemadmodum igitur manus, quæ recipit theſaurum donatum, non ditat, ſed theſaurus: ſic nec fides opus, vel actio nos juſtificat, ſed ipſe Chriſtus, quem fide apprehendimus. Et hoc eſt, quod Theologi Orthodoxi dicunt, nos juſtificari fide correlativè, & ratione Objecti fidem imputari in juſtitiam. Quæ aſſertio inde manifeſta eſt, quod apud* Paulum, *Rom.* 3. 27, 28. *opponitur hæc enuntiatio, Fide ſumus juſti, propoſitioni huic, Juſtificamur ex operibus, tanquam contradictoriæ. Quia è ex naturâ contradictionis perſpicuum eſt, non juſtificari quemquam Fide in quantum*

tum est opus sive nostrum, sive Dei in nobis, sed in quantum Christi meritum includit.

Rivet; *Fides excludit seipsam, quâ opus est. Unum enim opus non justificat, nec quidem potest justificare. Redeundum ergo ad Controversia statum, quo Fides statuitur justificare, non quatenus est opus, sive per se, sed relativè, quatenus significat applicationem justitiæ Christi, i. e. non nostræ, sed alienæ.* The same Author also saith thus, *Apostolus non distinguit inter Opera Legis, & Opera Fidei, sed in hoc negotio Fidem semper quibuslibet operibus opponit. Unde etiam sequitur fidem non justificare, quatenus est opus justitiæ, sed quatenus apprehendit justitiam Christi.* *In Gen. Exer. 73.* *Disput. De Fide Justif. §. 19.*

That we are justified by Faith, is without controversie, the Scripture being express for it: but when you say, That Faith properly taken doth justifie, which the Scripture saith not, in this I dissent from you. And also because you make Faith one Righteousness, by which we are justified, as indeed you must, if properly we be justified by it.

Davenant urgeth from *Rom.* 5. 18. That there is *unum tantùm δικαίωμα, quod ad justificationem vitæ Arg. 11. potest valere, nempe unius Christi obedientia.* Whence he infers, *Justificatio igitur vitæ non redundat in nos ab ullâ qualitate in nobismet ipsis inhærente, sed ab hâc justitiâ completâ Mediatoris nobis donatâ & imputatâ. Nostra justitia inhærens non habet in se δικαίωμα, hoc est, perfectionem justitiæ completam, & absolutam. Ergo non potest producere in nobis δικαίωσιν ζωῆς, &c.* *Ubi supra*

You mistake my Argument, and do not mind the Text which I alledged, *viz.* Acts 13. 39. *By him all that believe are justified,* &c. Therefore not only all that believe in Christ are justified, but it is by him that they are justified, *i. e.* by his Obedience, as it is expressed *Rom.* 5. 19. So that Christ's Obedience is that which is properly imputed for Righteousness, though it be so imputed only to those that believe; Faith to apprehend it, is required of us, that it may be imputed to us; and in that respect Faith is said to be imputed for Righteousness.

1. The first Note seems to shew thus much, That some may make Faith an Instrument of Justification, and yet deny that we are properly justified by it as by an Instru-

ment: Though if this be granted, I see not what you gain by it. For (as I said in the *Animadversion*) they that make Faith an Instrument of Justification, when they deny that we are properly justified by Faith; they mean, That Faith is not the * Righteousness by which we are justified; and that we are therefore only said to be justified by Faith, because by Faith we receive the Righteousness of Christ, by which Righteousness properly we are justified. That this is the meaning of our Divines, appears by that which I have before alledged.

* *Non est justitia, nec justitia loco habetur, &c. Rivet* before cited.

2. Therefore who those be, of whom you speak, I do not know: However, I do not see that your Objections are of force. For Faith is not wholly excluded as to the Text, though it be so interpreted, as that by [Faith imputed] is meant Christ and his Righteousness, *viz.* * as apprehended by Faith; and I presume that they whom you tax, did so understand it. And this doth not exclude Faith, but include it. Your Question therefore seems captious, [*If by Faith be meant Christ's Righteousness, then what word doth signifie Faith?*] For by Faith is not simply meant Christ's Righteousness, but as it is apprehended by Faith.

* See *Bucan* before cited.

3. *Davenant*'s words, which I cited, are clearly to the purpose to which I cited them; neither do I see any thing in them, which argue him to have been of another mind than I am of. Whereas you add, [*It seems he discerned the mistake of them, that affirm Christ's Active Righteousness as such to be our Righteousness*]. I think your Scribe did mistake, and it should be, [he discerned not]. For therein indeed, in that Chapter, but not in the words which I cited, he differs both from you and me: But I was willing to let that pass, both because it is nothing to our present purpose; and also I like not to shew my dissent from any eminent Writer, except I be forced to it.

4. What you say you will alledge out of *Davenant* against me, is to be considered when it is alledged. But here you profess your self far from approving what he saith, *viz.* That Christ's Righteousness *est formalis causa justificationis ex communi nostrorum sententia*; You should say, Christ's Righteousness imputed to us: for so *Davenant* hath it in the words which I cited. And you should also consider how immediately before those

words

words he explained himself about the *formalis causa justificationis.*

For *Bellarmine* objecting, That though *Christi obedientia sit meritoria causa justificationis nostra, propter quam Deus nos justificat*, yet *Justitia inherens potest esse formalis, per quam justificati constituimur*; and taxing *Chemnitium* for stating the question thus, *Quid sit id, propter quod Deus hominem in gratiam recipiat*, &c. He answers, *Sed immemorem se hîc prabet Jesuita, qui eodem modo & ipse loquitur de Just. lib. 2. cap. 1.* [*De Causâ formali, propter quam homo dicitur justus coram Deo, disserendum est*]. *Atque reverâ in Justificatione talis causa formalis ponenda est, quæ simul & meritoria esse possit. Nisi enim illam contineat dignitatem in se, propter quam homo vitè justificatus reputetur, nunquam erit formalis causa, per quam justificatus existat in conspectu Dei.* De Just. Habit. cap. 22.

And again, *Ut itaque seponamus Philosophicas Speculationes de naturâ causæ formalis, quando formalem causam quærimus justificationis nostræ, quærimus propter quod peccator in gratiam Dei recipitur, per quod immediatè Deo gratus, & ad vitam æternam acceptus stat, cujus beneficio damnatoriam Legis sententiam evadere, denique quo intùs possit, & debeat ad cœlestis Judicis favorem & approbationem consequendam.* Ibid.

And again, *Quod igitur dicit* Bellarminus, *impossibile esse, ut per justitiam Christi imputatam formaliter justi simus, si per formaliter intelligat inhærenter, nugas agit*, &c. *Si autem per formalem causam intelligat illud ipsum, quod Deus intuetur quando quemvis peccatorem justificat*, &c. *dico hoc non esse inhærentem ullam qualitatem, sed Christi obedientiam & justitiam credentibus gratuitâ Dei misericordiâ donatam atque imputatam. Impossibile quidem est, ut hæc justitia, quæ in Christo inhæret, sit etiam nostra per modum inhæsionis; sed quando tanquam membra unimur Christo capiti, non est impossibile, ut nostra fiat per modum donationis, & salutiferæ participationis: atque hic modus sufficit, ut in Justificatione formalis causæ rationem, efficaciam, & similitudinem obtineat.* Ibid. cap. 24. ad 5.

Me-thinks all this should suffice to satisfie any ingenuous Man, and to cut off all occasion of quarrelling about

the term, when there is so full and frequent explication of the meaning of it.

Contra Bellar. tom. 4. l. 6. c. 1. §. 1.

So also *Amesius* having out of *Contarenus* distinguished of Righteousness, and stated the Question about the formal cause of Justification, he saith, *Hoc sensu nos negamus formalem causam absolutæ* (*N. B.*) *nostræ justificationis esse justitiam in nobis inhærentem.*

Ibid. §. 22.

And again, *Non aliâ ratione formaliter nos justos nominari, & esse dicimus imputatâ Christi justitiâ, quam quâ is cujus debitum ab altero solvitur nominatur & est ab illo debito liber & immunis; & quâ is cui procuratus est alterius favor aut gratia, nominatur & est alteri gratus.* For that which you cite out of his *Med. l. 1. c. 27. §. 12.* I find there only these words, *Christi igitur justitia in justificatione fidelibus imputatur*, Phil. 3. 9.

Edit. 3. per Rob. Allotum Londini, 1629.

Those which you add are not in my Edition, *viz. Quatenus ejus merito justi coram Deo reputamur.*

However they are not repugnant to what I have cited, both from him and *Davenant*, because (as *Davenant* expressly notes) *Causa formalis hic etiam est meritoria.* *Alsted*'s words, as you cite them, [*Christus est justitia nostra in sensu causali, non in sensu formali*] carry no good sense, at least are not so accurate. For surely if *Formalis Causa*, then *Sensus Formalis* is also *Sensus Causalis.*

You add, [So *Rivet Disp. de Fide.*] but you should also have noted the Section. Indeed §. 13. he saith, That *Bellarmine* doth *affingere nobis sententiam de justitiâ Christi, tanquam causâ formali.* And elsewhere he saith, *Forma justificationis consistit in justitiæ Christi imputatione, propter quam nobis remittuntur peccata.*

Colledg. Controvers. Disp. 34.

Instit. lib. 2.

So *Trelcatius*, *Forma justificationis, Activè sumpta, est Actualis Justitiæ Christi gratuita imputatio, quâ meritum & obedientia Christi nobis applicantur, vi communionis arctissimæ, quâ ille in nobis, & nos in illo.*

Of Justifying Faith *Sect. 2. chap. 18.*

Dr. *Jackson* saith, That *to demand what is the formal cause of Justification, is as if one should ask what is the Latin for* Manus: *and that it is the folly or knavery of our Adversaries to demand a formal Cause of their Justification, who deny themselves to be formally just in the sight of God.* [*He alone* (saith he) *is formally just, who hath that form inherent in himself, by which he*

he is denominated just, and so accepted of God: as Philosophers deny the Sun to be formally hot, because it hath no form of heat inherent in it, but only produceth heat in other Bodies].

Thus there is difference among our Divines about the term, but they agree in the thing. Some would have no formal Cause of Justification at all; some would have such a Cause, but would not have Christ's Righteousness imputed, but the imputation of Christ's Righteousness to be it: yet both the one and the other do indeed hold the Righteousness of Christ to be the formal Cause of Justification, in that sense as *Davenant* and *Ames* do explain it.

1. As Faith alone is the Condition of our Justification, so also Faith alone as continued (though it is not continued alone) is the Condition of our Continued Justification. 54.

Neque etiam (saith *Calvin*) *sic putemus commendari post gratuitam justificationem opera, ut & ipsa in locum justificandi hominis posteà succedant, aut ejusmodi officium cum Fide* (*N. B.*) *partiantur. Nisi enim perpetuò maneat solida Fidei justificatio, illorum immundities detegetur. Nihil autem absonum est, sic Fide hominem justificari, ut non ipse modo justus sit sed opera quoque ejus supra dignitatem justa censeantur.* *Inst. lib. 3. cap. 17. § 9.*

So Mr. *Ball*, [*Faith doth not begin to apprehend Life, and then leave it to works, that we might attain the accomplishment by them, but it doth ever rest upon the Promise until we come to enjoy it*]. Of Faith, Part 2. Chap. 4. p. 252, 253

2. I know no accusation but of the Law of Works, though in case of unbelief and impenitency that Accusation be aggravated by the Law of Grace.

Though *Calvin* thinks not that *Joh.* 5. 45. [*Do not think that I will accuse you to my Father; there is one that accuseth you, even* Moses, *&c.*] to be to this purpose, as some do; yet he grants, That it is *Legis propriè reos peragere infideles.* *Calvin* in *Joh.* 5. 45.

To question whether he spake of the Law of Works, were to question whether the Sun shineth at noon-day. When any is accused to be an Infidel, or finally impenitent, or a sinner against the Holy Ghost, as it is a sin that he is accused of, so the Accusation is from the Law: but as Unbelief or Impenitency (for why you bring in the sin against the Holy Ghost, I do not know) doth import

a want of the Condition required in the Gospel, so (as I have said before) it is no new accusation, but only a re-inforcing of a former accusation; and so the refelling of this Accusation, by shewing the fruits of Faith and Repentance, is not properly a justifying of our selves by any thing in our selves, but only a proving and manifesting that we are indeed justified by the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us.

3. The imperfection of our Faith and Obedience doth prove that it is no Righteousness by which we can be justified; consider always, that I speak of absolute and universal Justification.

Instit. lib. 3. c. 11. §. 7. *Si per se* (saith *Calvin*) *vel intrinsecâ, ut loquuntur, virtute justificaret fides, ut est semper debilis & imperfecta, non efficeret hoc nisi ex parte; sic manca esset justitia, qua frustulum salutis nobis conferret.*

De Instit. Habit. cap. 26. Arg. 3. So *Davenant*, *Ad justificationem efficiendam non sufficit justitia suo quodam modo perfecta, & aliquo modo imperfecta; sed necesse est eam esse legali modo perfectam, & omnibus suis numeris absolutam.* And again,

Ibid. Arg. 4. *Nulla justitia coram Deo justificat, sed quæ ad amussim Legis perfecta est: Sed nostra inhærens non est talis, &c.*

De Justif. Disp. 11. Thus also *Maccovius*, *Quod nobis imputatur ad justitiam, (nempe propriè & per se, seu respectu sui) id debet esse perfectissimum, ut consistere possit cum judicio Dei*, Rom. 2. 2. *At Fides non est perfectissima*, 1 Cor. 13. 9.

Ibid. To me it seems not hard to be certain of the meaning of that place, *Luke* 7. 47. [*Many sins are forgiven her, for she loved much*]. It appears (as I noted) plainly enough by the Context, what the meaning is, *viz.* not that her love was the cause of the forgiveness of her sins, but the forgiveness of her sins the cause of her love: And you see how sharply *Calvin* (whose words I cited) censures those that interpret it otherwise.

In Luc. 7. 42. The Parable going before those words are so clear, That *Maldonate* is forced to say, *Videtur ex hâc parabolâ non fuisse colligendum, quod Christus colligit, multa peccata illi mulieri remitti, quia multum dilexisset, sed contrà propterea eam multum dilexisse, quòd multa illi peccata remissa essent.* — *Quæ res speciosam* Calvino, *& cæteris hæreticis, errandi occasionem præbuit, negantibus hujc mulieri propter præcedentia charitatis opera remissa*

peccata;

peccata; illa verò verba, quoniam dilexit multum, sic interpretantibus, ut dictio illa quoniam, non causam, sed effectum, & consequentiam significet: quod utinam nemo Catholicorum secutus esset.

And see how poorly and pittifully he comes off, *viz.* either thus, *Ut Christum inversâ parabolâ usum fuisse deceremus. q. d. Sicut ille dilexit multum, quia multum illi remissum fuerat; ita huic mulieri è contrario, quia dilexit multum, remissa sunt peccata multa.* Or, which he rather inclines unto, thus, *Quod Christus hoc loco rogat, Quis ergo eum plus diliget ejus futurum tempus est, tamen ex consuetudine loquendi vim præteriti habere puto. q. d. Quem tu judicas, ex effectu conjecturam faciens, plus antè Dominum suum dilexisse? Utrùm illi magis amicum fuisse, cum amicitiæ causa fœnerator debitum utrique remiserit?* What straits was this acute Man driven to, because he was resolved to hold the Conclusion, and yet saw how ill it did suit with the Premises?

1. What others, of whom you speak do, I know not; they may answer for themselves. *Ibid.*

2. I take affiance (which is a Believing in, or Relying on) to be an Act of Faith it self, the Act of Faith being as well *Credere in*, as *simpliciter Credere*. But internal Obedience or Love, (for these you make both one, though indeed Believing it self is inward Obedience as well as Love, the one being commanded as well as the other) is not the Act of Faith, though caused by Faith; not *actus elicitus*, though *actus imperatus*: therefore this is not so immediate a product of Faith as the other.

3. I conceive Affiance to be a part of Justifying-Faith, and not only a Fruit of it. *To believe in Christ*, which is as much as to rely on him, and to have affiance in him, is requisite unto Justification. *He that believeth on him is not condemned*, John 3. 18.

1. As Justification is begun upon sole Believing, so is it also continued and consummated. The Scripture (so far as I see) makes Justification simply and absolutely to depend on Faith, and not only in respect of the beginning of it: yet (it is true) Justification is neither begun, nor continued, nor consummated upon such a Believing as is not attended with other Duties. That this is the Uniform Doctrine of the prime Protestants, I *Ibid.*

ſhewed by the confeſſion of our greateſt Adverſary, to which you oppoſe nothing?

Multa ad juſtificationem requiruntur quæ non juſtificant Amef. *contra* Bellar. *tom.* 4. *l.* 5. *cap.* 1. §. 1. *De Reconcil.* part 1. *lib.* 2. *c.* 18.

2. Though ſome other things beſides Faith muſt go before Juſtification, yet do they not therefore juſtifie as well as Faith, it being only Faith that doth apprehend Chriſt, by whom ſo apprehended we are juſtified.

Neque tamen hæc fides (ſaith *Wotton*) *ſpem, dilectionem, timorem, pœnitentiam excludere cenſenda eſt, quaſi ad eum, qui juſtificatus eſt, non pertinerent; ſed hæc omnia ab officio juſtificandi* (*N. B.*) *ſignificantur penitus excludi. Atque hoc quidem juſtificandi munus ſoli Fidei convenire, his rationibus oſtendo. Quia ſolâ Fide rectà in Chriſtum tendimus, ut per eum juſtificemur, & promiſſiones Dei de juſtificatione amplectimur. 2. Ubicunque Spiritus Sanctus diſertis verbis loquitur de juſtificatione impii, ejuſque cauſas ex hominis parte aſſignat, nullam ejuſmodi cauſam aſſignat niſi fidem.*

Loc. Com. Claſſ. 2. *Loc.* 19. *de Juſtif. ex Tom.* 2. *in Gen.*

But hear alſo *Luther*, who doth both thunder and lighten in this particular: *Cur inſane Sophiſta, aſſeris dilectionem, ſpem, & alias virtutes? Scio has eſſe inſigenia Dei dona, divinitùs mandata, per Spiritum Sanctum in noſtris cordibus excitari & ali. Scio fidem ſine his donis non exiſtere; ſed nunc nobis quæſtio eſt, quid cujuſque proprium ſit. Tenes manus varia ſemina, non autem quæro ego, quâ cum quibus conjuncta ſint, ſed quæ cujuſque propria virtus. Hic apertè dic quid faciat Sola Fides, non cum quibus virtutibus conjuncta ſit. Sola autem Fides apprehendit promiſſionem, credit promittenti Deo, Deo porrigenti aliquid admovet manum, & id accipit. Hoc proprium ſolius Fidei eſt; Charitas, Spes, Patientia habent alias materias, circa quas verſantur; habent alios limites, intra quos conſiſtunt. Non enim amplectuntur promiſſionem, ſed mandata exequuntur; audiunt Deum mandantem, non audiunt Deum promittentem, ut Fides facit.*

55. *Ibid.*

In the next Section we are agreed.

To this long Section I need not ſay much. For now that you explain your ſelf, there ſeems to be but little difference betwixt us. All that I aim at, is this, That Chriſt ſimply conſidered, is not the Object of Juſtifying Faith, but Chriſt as promiſed in the Goſpel: ſo that to believe in Chriſt, doth imply a believing of the Promiſe, and that not only ſo as to aſſent unto it, but ſo alſo as to apply

apply it. And therefore we often find in Scripture, That the Axiome or Propoſition concerning Chriſt, is made the Object of Juſtifying and Saving Faith, ſee *Rom.*10.9. 1 *Joh.*5.1. *Acts* 8. 37. *Joh.*6.69. And thus our Divines often ſpeak of Faith juſtifying as apprehending the Promiſes.

Sola Fides (ſaith *Luther*) *apprehendit Promiſſionem.* *Locis paulò ante citatis.*

So *Wotton*; *Solâ Fide Promiſſiones Dei de juſtificatione amplectimur.*

And Mr. *Ball*, [*For Faith only doth behold and receive the Promiſes of Life and Mercy*, &c. *When therefore Juſtification and Life is ſaid to be by Faith, it is manifeſtly ſignified, That Faith receiving the Promiſe, doth receive Righteouſneſs and Life freely promiſed*]. Of the Coven. ch. 3. p. 19.

But I willingly grant, That the Axiome, Propoſition or Promiſe doth but ſerve to convey Chriſt unto us, and the apprehending and receiving of him, is the Faith by which we are juſtified. Only I ſay, it is Chriſt in the Promiſe, or Chriſt promiſed, who muſt be apprehended and received unto Juſtification.

Fidei objectum quod (ſaith *Ames.*) *vel materiale*; *eſt quicquid à Deo revelatur ac proponitur credendum*, &c. —— *Hoc objectum eſt immediatè ſemper aliquod axioma vel enuntiatio ſub ratione veri*; *ſed illud, in quo principaliter terminatur Fides, de quo, & propter quod aſſenſus præbetur illi axiomati per fidem, eſt Ens incomplexum ſub ratione boni*, Rom. 4. 21. Heb. 11. 13. *Actus enim credentis non terminatur ad axioma, ſed ad rem. ſatentibus Scholaſticorum clariſſimis. Ratio eſt, quia non formamus axiomata, niſi ut per ea de rebus cognitionem habeamus. Principalis igitur terminus, in quem tendit actus credentis, eſt res ipſa, quæ in axiomate præcipuè ſpectatur.* *Medul. l. 1. c. 5. §. 21. Ibid. §. 23, 24.*

All this I like well enough, ſave that he ſeems to make the Act of Faith exerciſed about an Axiome or Enunciation to be only Aſſent, as to that which is true; whereas ſomtimes it is alſo Apprehenſion and Receiving as of that which is good, though (it's true) this Act of Faith is principally terminated in the thing, which the Axiome or Enunciation doth contain in it.

1. I do not ſay, That the receiving of Chriſt as King is *Fides quæ juſtificat*, though I grant it is *Actus fidei qua juſtificat.* 56, & 57.

2. I

2. I refer [*quâ*] to [*Justificât*] *q. d.* [Faith which justifieth, doth receive Christ as King; yet this is not the Act of Faith, whereby it justifieth]. Or if you will, thus; Christ as King is the object of Faith, which justifieth, but not of Faith as it justifieth. Indeed Faith, which justifieth hath respect to the whole Word of God, yet only to the Word of Promise concerning Christ, and the Mercy of God in Christ, as it justifieth.

Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. Lib. 5. c. 1. §. 1, 2. *Non tam quæritur* (*inquit* Amesius) *quæ aut quid sit Fides, quæ justificat, quàm quæ sit ratio quâ propriè dicitur justificare.* And presently after follow the words, which I cited in the Animadversions. Again, *Una & eadem* (*inquit*) *Fides est, quâ placemus Deo ad reconciliationem, & jam reconciliati dirigimur & sustinemur ad placendum ipsi in Obedientiâ novâ.* *Ibid. cap. 2. §. 1.* And again, *Fidem illam, quæ justificat, præsupponere, involvere, & inferre concedimus fidem Historiæ, atque etiam* (*in quibusdam olim*) *miraculorum: sed historiæ ac miraculorum fidem sæpè à justificatione separari palam est; Quamvis multa sint exercitia & objecta Fidei, non tamen justificans est, nisi prout respicit misericordiam Dei in Christo. Hinc omnes illi, quorum fides in eo capite* (Heb. 11.) *laudatur, collimabant ad promissionem illam misererordiæ in Christo.* *Ibid. §. 8.*

3. Where do I say, That the receiving of Christ as King doth justifie, that you ask me in what sense it doth so? I say, Justifying Faith doth receive Christ as King, but not as justifying; or that Faith in that respect doth not justifie.

4. Faith as the Condition of Justification is the receiving of Christ as satisfying for us.

5. If Christ's Satisfaction only be our Righteousness, by which we are justified; and Christ as Priest only made Satisfaction for us, then by receiving Christ as Priest only we are justified. This you might perceive was the meaning of the Argument, though I left out the word [only].

And here also I have Mr. *Blake* agreeing with me, as (I think) in every point, wherein we differ, if he have occasion to treat of it. *Of the Coven. c. 12. p. 79.* ‘[It is true (*saith he*) that ‘Faith accepts Christ as Lord as well as Saviour: but it ‘is the acceptation of him as Saviour, not as Lord, that ‘justifies. Christ rules his People as a King, teacheth ‘them as a Prophet, but makes atonement for them as a ‘Priest,

'Priest, by giving himself in Sacrifice, his Blood for re-
'mission of Sins. These must be distinguished, but not
'divided: Faith hath an eye at all, the Blood of Christ,
'the Command of Christ, the Doctrine of Christ: but
'as it ties and fastens on his Blood, so it justifies. *He is*
'*set out a propitiation through Faith in his Blood*, Rom.
'3.24. not through Faith in his Command. It is the
'Blood of Christ that cleanseth from all sin, and not the
'Sovereignty of Christ. These confusions of the di-
'stinct parts of Christ's Mediatorship, and the several
'offices of Faith may not be suffered. Scripture assigns
'each its particular Place and Work. Sovereignty doth
'not cleanse, nor Blood command us: Faith in his
'Blood, not Faith yeelding to his Sovereignty, doth justi-
'fie us. There are several acts of Justifying-Faith,
'*Heb.* 11. but those are not acts of Justification. It is
'not *Abraham*'s Obedience, *Moses* Self-denyal, *Gideon*
'or *Sampson*'s Valour, that was their Justification, but
'his Blood, who did enable them in these things by his
'Spirit'].

Your Similitude is not suitable; for a Woman receiving a Man for her Husband, may be enriched or dignified by him, though she never look at him as rich or honourable, but only as her Husband. But we must look at Christ as a Priest, and as making Satisfaction for us, that so we may be justified by him. For the Scripture doth set forth Christ unto us in that respect for our Justification; see *Apoc.* 1. 5. *Heb.* 9. 26. 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult.* *Rom.* 8. 34. where those words [*It is Christ that died*] shew how Christ doth justifie us, and free us from condemnation, *viz.* by dying, and so satisfying for our sins. That which follows of Christ's Resurrection, *&c.* seems (as to our Justification) but for our more full assurance of the benefit of Christ's Death, and for the effectual application of his Satisfaction, which he made for us by his Death, that so we may be justified by him.

6. You grant, that Christ, not as King, but as Priest, doth justifie us meritoriously and satisfactorily; and that is it which I urge, That Christ's Satisfaction, which as Priest he made for us, is that whereby, or for which we are justified. Now we speak of receiving Christ unto Justification, therefore we must consider him as satisfying for us, and so receive him as to that purpose, *viz.*

out

our Justification; though (I grant) whole Christ, or Christ in respect of all his Offices must be received; neither may we think to have him as a Priest to satisfie for us, except we also have him as a Prophet to instruct us, and as a King to govern us. So I usually Preach and Teach.

57. (p. 69.) 1. When you say, That I leave the Errour in his Language, but not in his Sense, your words are ambiguous. For they may import, That I leave, *i. e.* relinquish and desert the Error the one way, but not the other. Or that I leave, *i. e.* let the Error abide and remain in his Language, but not in his Sense. This I take to be your meaning, for else you could not say (except ironically, which I do not suspect) that it is a fair Exposition, and that you like it. I have no reason to strive about another's words, especially not knowing how they are brought in: but I think meet to interpret words in the best sense that they will bear: neither do I yet see but those words which you tax as foully erroneous, may admit that fair interpretation which I made of them.

2. Where *Amesius* hath those words, you do not shew: But surely he there speaks *de Fide Justificante quâ talis.* For otherwise he should neither agree with the Truth, nor with himself in saying, *Christus est objectum adaquatum Fidei justificantis.* The whole Word of God is the Object of Justifying-Faith, though not of Faith as Justifying; and so much is acknowledged by *Amesius*, as appears by his words before cited. Neither again doth he speak of Christ in all respects, but as Christ is the Propitiation for our sins, as is clear by that very place which you now take into consideration.

Besides, I find *Amesius* to have such words as you mention, but withall to add such, as plainly to express what I say. *Christus (inquit) est adaquatum objectum Fidei, quatenus (N. B.) Fides Justificat. Fides etiam non aliâ ratione justificat, nisi quatenus apprehendit illam justitiam, (N. B.) propter quam justificamur.*

Medul. lib. 1. c. 27. §. 17.

Ibid. & 58.

1. The Text (1 *John* 4. 19.) cannot (I think) be rightly understood but as I interpreted it. For *v.* 10, 11. the Apostle speaketh of God's great love manifested unto us, in giving his Son for us. And *v.* 19. he shews whence it is that we love God, *viz.* from hence, that God loved us first, *i. e.* we apprehending the Love of God to us,

(p. 70.)

us, answer his love with love again. *Amat non immeritò, qui amatus sine merito*, as *Bernard* speaketh. Yet we must first find and feel the love of God towards us, before we can love him for what he hath done for us.

2. There is more than a bare assenting Act of Faith going before the Love, of which I speak.

3. Embracing, which from *Heb.* 11. 13. I note to be the compleating Act of Justifying-Faith, doth include or presuppose *amorem desiderii*; we can never sincerely embrace Christ, if we do not desire him: but *amor delectationis*, or *complacentiæ* doth follow after embracing, *viz.* when the thing desired is enjoyed. All that you add, holds only in respect of the former kind, not in respect of the latter.

1. There are divers kinds of Love, but I speak of that Love which differs from Desire; and so did you seem to understand it, as I noted from your words, *Aphorism*, p. 267. 58.

2. Whereas you say, [*There is no need of Faith to make it present, before it can be accepted and loved*]; you cannot by Faith mean Assent, for that, you grant, doth go before Love and Acceptance. And if by Faith you mean Acceptance, surely there must be Acceptance, before a thing can be accepted, though in time these go together. But perhaps you only mean, That though Faith as an Assent, must go before in time, and as an Acceptance must go before in Nature, yet not so as to make a thing present. For you add, That God's Offer doth make it present. But though the Offer be present, yet the thing offered is not present, so as the Object of the Love of Complacency must be: for it must be present by way of Enjoyment, but the offer of a thing can only make it to be hoped for; so that the thing, though it be offered, yet until it be accepted, it is absent, because it is not enjoyed. The thing offered must be desirously, and in that respect lovingly accepted; but it must first be accepted, and then loved, so as to joy and delight in it.

3. We look at Christ as enjoyed, when we love him with the Love of Complacency and Delight, of which Love I speak.

Gaudium

Theolog. Natur. Tit. 95. *Gaudium oritur ex hoc,* (ſaith *Raimundus de Sebunda*) *quòd aliqua res ſcit ſe habere id, quod habet, & non ex hoc dumtaxat, quod habet.*

There muſt both be the Having of a thing, and alſo the Knowing that we have it, that we may rejoyce in it.

4. As Aſſent muſt go before Acceptance, ſo muſt Acceptance go before that Love, of which I ſpeak.

Ibid. 1. I did not ſay, or think, that you thought ſo of all Love, *viz.* that it conſidereth its Object as preſent or enjoyed; for there is no diſtinguiſhing here of theſe, as I have ſhewed before; the Object is not preſent, except it be enjoyed. You grant that *Amor Complacentiæ* doth ſo conſider its Object; and I thought you had meant that kind of Love, becauſe you did diſtinguiſh Love from Deſire. Therefore I ſaid, [Love as you take it, conſidereth its Object as preſent and enjoyed] *viz.* Love as diſtinguiſhed from Deſire. I know not (I confeſs) what to make of Love, but either a Deſire, if the Object be abſent, or a Delight, if the Object be preſent.

2. That which you ſay concerning Acceptance, Election, and Conſent, is nothing to me, who do not enquire whether they be divers acts or no, but only ſhew that they go before Enjoyment, and ſo differ from Love, as I take it, *viz.* Love of Complacency, which doth follow Enjoyment.

59. I take the Love of Deſire to go before Acceptance, and the Love of Complacency to follow after it. Although *Amare & velle bonum* be one and the ſame, yet this *velle bonum vel eſt cum deſiderio, ſi objectum abſit, vel cum Complacentiâ, ſi adſit.*

Part 1. Quæſt. 20. Art. 1. * *Nempe prius tempore, non naturâ.* *Aquinas* doth not ſatisfie me, when he ſaith, *Nullum deſiderat aliquid niſi bonum amatum neque aliquis gaudet niſi de bono amato*; if he mean, that a thing is *amatum prius* * *quàm deſideratum.* The very *Deſiderare* (I think) is *Amare*, and ſo is *Gaudere* alſo; but the one is *Amare quod abeſt*, the other *Amare quod adeſt.* So you in the next Section ſay, [*Deſire is Love, and Complacency is Love*].

Ibid. 1. I did not doubt, much leſs deny that there is *Amor Deſiderii*, as well as *Amor Complacentiæ*; only I ſhewed, that your words there muſt be meant of the former, in which ſenſe I did not oppoſe you, but as it is taken in the other

other ſenſe; and ſo you ſeemed to take it before, becauſe you did expreſly diſtinguiſh it from Deſire.

Neither is your ſecond any thing againſt me.

3. The Scripture is not ſo much to be interpreted according to the moſt comprehenſive ſenſe, as according to the moſt proper ſenſe, *viz.* that which doth beſt agree with the Context and other places of Scripture.

Your fourth containeth nothing but a *Sarcaſm* very unworthily uſed of ſuch a worthy Man as *Calvin* was.

1. The places, which you alledg (*John* 16. 27. and 14. 21.) do not prove, that Love, *viz.* our Love is an antecedent Condition of God's Love, and Chriſt's Love to us, ſo that we muſt firſt love God and Chriſt, before we can be reconciled unto God in Chriſt. For becauſe we are reconciled unto God in Chriſt, therefore we love God and Chriſt, 1 *John* 4. 19. The meaning of thoſe other places (as *Calvin* notes) is this, That they that love God, *inſculptum habent in cordibus Patrni ejus amoris teſtimonium*: To which may be added, That God will ſtill manifeſt his Love to them more and more. *Ibid.*

2. Not only Love, but Obedience alſo muſt go before Glorification; but it doth not therefore follow, That they muſt go before Juſtification, as your ſelf hold that Obedience doth not as we are at firſt juſtified. That there is any other Condition of Juſtification at laſt than at firſt, is more than I can find in Scripture.

1. What ſome have anſwered, and what you have read in others I know not; you cite none whoſe Works are extant, but only Mr. *Ball*, and him at large, [*On the Covenant*] but where in that Book you do not ſhew. I find there that he doth uſe the words [*Inſtrument*] and [*Condition*] promiſcuouſly. *Ibid.*

[*The Covenant of Grace* (ſaith he) *exacteth no other thing inherent in us, as a Cauſe* (viz. *inſtrumental*) *of Juſtification, or a Condition* (*N.B.*) *in reſpect of which we are juſtified, but Faith alone*]. This is point-blank againſt that which you ſay of him. And again, [*It is* (ſaith he) *the ſole Inſtrumental or Conditional* (*N.B.*) *Cauſe required on our part to Juſtification*]. Of the Coven. p. 65. *Ibia.*

As I ſhewed before in the *Animadverſions, ad pag.* 243. our Divines ſay, *Fides ſola juſtificat, ſed Fides quæ juſtificat, non eſt ſola*: but they mean that Love and Obedience follow as the fruits and effects of Faith.

Thus

Thus *Stapleton* somewhere (I cannot now cite the place) testifyeth of them, saying, *Omnes ad unum Protestantes docent Fidem justificantem esse vivam, & operantem per charitatem, atque alia bona opera.*

2. I grant, That *Amor Concupiscentiæ* is prerequisite; if you will call it so, as I see not but you may, though *Amor Concupiscentiæ* is usually opposed to *Amor Amicitiæ*, and so you speak of it, *p.* 58. And if you speak not of *Amor Complacentiæ*, then neither do I speak against you. For of that do I speak, and had reason (I think) to understand you as speaking of it, because you spake of Love as distinct from Desire. Perhaps you speak of it only in respect of its Generical Nature, abstracting from the consideration of either Desire or Complacency, which are the Species of it: but surely these two taking up the whole nature of Love, that Love which is not the one of these, must needs be the other. We accept or chuse a thing, because we first Love, *i. e.* desire it, or (as we use to say) have a mind to it: and having accepted and chosen it, we further love it, so as to delight in it, except our Love turn into Hatred, as *Amnon*'s unchast Love did: but the very Accepting or Chusing of a thing is not (that I see) properly a Loving of it.

3. I grant, that all Love doth not presuppose Acceptance, Consent, &c. the Love of Desire doth not; but the Love of Complacency doth. This is all that I have desired, and so much you have yeelded.

Ibid. 1. The distinction of *Fides quæ*, and *Fides quâ*, as it is frequently used by our Learned Writers, so it doth hold good notwithstanding any thing you have said, or (I suppose) can say against it.

Disp. de Fide Just. §. 16. *Quamvis hanc controversiam elevent*, (saith *Rivet*, speaking of the Remonstrants) *nec ciccum* (*ut loquuntur*) *interdiunt, an Fides quæ est viva, an Fides quâ est viva, ad justificationem requiratur, & Logicam tantùm pugnam esse velint, Logica tamen hac pugna realem continet magni momenti. Siquis enim dicat, Christus qui homo est infinitus, & Christus quâ homo est infinitus, nemo sanus existimabit nihil differre has enuntiationes.*

I grant you more than you require, That not only Christ as Lord, but even the whole Word of God is the Object of Justifying Faith; but not therefore of Faith as Justifying. The Hand may receive both Meat and Mony, yet

yet it doth not enrich, as it receiveth Meat, nor feed as it receiveth Mony.

2. If Christ's Satisfaction be our Righteousness, (which I think you have ever affirmed, though you would also have another Righteousness of our own, and that unto Justification;) then I see not but that I may speak of Faith laying hold on and apprehending Christ's Satisfaction. For though the Satisfaction was made unto God, yet it was made for us; and in that respect we are to lay hold on it, and receive it, and not only to assent to the truth of it.

You somewhere cite *Bellarmine* yeelding unto us thus much, *Imputari nobis Christi merita, quia nobis donata sunt, & possumus ea Deo Patri offerre pro peccatis nostris, quoniam Christus suscepit super se onus satisfaciendi pro nobis, nosque Deo Patri reconciliandi.*

Which words also *Amesius* doth cite, and interpret to be as much as if he did say, *Christi merita sunt nobis à Deo donata, ut possimus ea pro nobis Deo offerre tanquam Satisfactionem pro peccatis nostris.* *Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. l. 6. c. 1. §. 22.*

It is *Satisfactio Christi*, though by Faith it becomes *Nostra*, which we must *offerre Deo*: but first we must by Faith receive it, before we can have any interest in it, to make such use of it. Faith justifieth (I grant) as a Condition, because it is required of us, that we may be partakers of Christ's Righteousness; but it is not Faith properly, but the Righteousness of Christ by which we are justified. (*p. 72.*)

Recte Contarenus (saith *Amesius*) *in Tract. de Justif. Fide justificamur, non formaliter, sicut Albedo efficit parietem album, aut Sanitas hominem sanum; sed efficienter, sicut Linitio efficit parientem album, & Medicatio efficit sanum: sic, vel non dissimili ratione, Fides efficit hominem justum, & justificat.* *Ubi supra lib. 5. c. 4. §. 12.*

I like your Explication which you now make, and I think my labour well bestowed, as being the occasion of it. I perceive all that you mean is this, That the Covenant wherein God doth give Christ, is not of force to make Christ ours until we believe. This who can question, Christ being given to be ours only upon condition of believing? Yet Christ being so conditionally given in the Covenant, upon our believing he is made ours by vertue of the Covenant: so that still I see not but that our be- *Ibid. & 60.* (*p. 73.*)

lieving doth immediately make Christ ours, there being nothing more to that end required of us, but to believe. But how will it follow, that God doth justifie Men before they believe, when by his Covenant he doth not justifie but upon condition of Believing? The Grant of a thing being Conditional, it cannot be actually obtained until the Condition be performed, though upon the performance of the Condition by vertue of the Grant there be actual enjoyment.

6. (p. 73.) Whether the receiving of Christ as Priest, and the receiving of him as King be two distinct acts, doth little concern our purpose; yet I think the Acts may be distinct, though I deny not but Christ may be received at once in both respects: yet if he be, it is the receiving of him as Priest, not as King, that doth justifie. I grant that the receiving of Christ in respect of any one Office doth virtually include the receiving of him in respect of all his Offices: and he that doth not so receive Christ in respect of his Priestly Office, as to be ready to receive him also in respect of his Kingly Office, when Christ shall so be set forth unto him, doth not at all receive him: such a Faith is a false Faith, and cannot justifie. Yet may there be a receiving of Christ as Priest without an express and direct receiving of him as King, though implicitly and by consequence he be received as such. Neither is it a false Knowledg, though it be an imperfect Knowledg to know Christ as a Priest, and not to know him as a King. And that Christ is sometimes propounded only as a Priest, *i. e.* with express mention only of his Priestly Office, seems clear and undeniable by divers places of Scripture; see *John* 1. 29, 36. and 3. 14, 15. and so other places which speak of Christ as suffering for us, not mentioning his Sovereignty over us, though that is there implied and expressed in other places. And though he be (as sometimes he is) expressly set forth at once both as Priest and King, and so must expresly be received at once in both respects; yet it hinders not, but that the receiving of Christ as Priest, and not the receiving of him as King, is that which justifieth. One may at once receive divers things, and yet those things not all serve for one and the same use, but one thing may serve for one use, and another thing for another use, all being, though in several respects, useful and necessary to be received.

You

You say that you are of my mind in all this, yet you seem to differ from me, in that you make Affiance a Fruit of Acceptance, which you make the very Act of Faith by which we are justified; whereas I taking Affiance for Recumbency, and for that which is meant by Believing in Christ, and Embracing him, make it to be the very Justifying Act of Faith. That Believing in Christ doth principally import Assent I cannot see: to Believe indeed doth seem principally to import Assent; but to Believe in, seems principally to import Affiance. *Ibid.* (74.)

Credere in Christum (as *Ferus* saith well) *est certâ, firmâ, & stabili fiduciâ Christum, omniaque ejus bona complecti, eique toto corde, totâ animâ, totisque viribus inhærere.* *In Joh. 6. 29.*

So *Wotton*; *Quid est in Christum credere? An id solummodo; credere vera esse, quæ Christus loquitur? At quid opus erat Spiritui Sancto tam novum & insolens verbum usurpare, præsertim obscurum etiam, & à vulgi intelligentia remotum? Quod rectè & clarè dici potuit, Χριστῷ πιστεύειν, id Spiritus Sanctus novo more dicendi, εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύειν, voluit obscurare? Nam hic certè loquendi modus, εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύειν, totus est à Spiritu Sancto illi proprius, nec ullum è Græcis autorem agnovit, ne illos quidem LXX Interpretes, qui Hebræa Biblia Græce reddiderunt, à quibus Apostoli & Evangelistæ multa in Scriptis suis, quod ipsum loquendi modum attinet, crebrò mutuentur. Quamobrem plus quàm verisimile videtur Spiritum Sanctum quum novo loquendi more utatur, quem fiduciam significare perspicuum est, aliud quoddam præter communem vocis significationem proponere voluisse.* De Reconcil. part 1. lib. 2. c. 14.

I find that *Seneca* doth use the Latin Phrase, *Hunc* (*inquit*) *Deum quis colet? quis credet in eum?* Where [*Credet in eum*] is as much as [*fiduciam in eo collocabit*]. And so the Phrase of [*Believing in*] used in the New Testament, seems to import as much as the Phrases of [*Trusting in*] and [*staying on*] used in the Old Testament, as namely, *Isa.* 50. 10. See Mr. *Ball* of Faith, *part* 1. *chap.* 3. *p.* 24, *&c.* *In Ludo de morte Claudii Cæsaris.*

So far as I can judg, your success is not answerable to your desire. But if you did not intend to infer such a conclusion from your earnest seeking the Lord's Direction on your Knees, I know not to what purpose you did speak (74.) 61.

of it. For if it were only to ſhew the ſincerity of your deſire, What is your Cauſe advantaged, though that be granted, as I know not why any ſhould queſtion it ?

Ibid. What is that which you ſay is yeelded ? That Faith doth not juſtifie, as it is the fulfilling of the Condition of the whole Covenant ? Yet you make Juſtifying-Faith, as ſuch, to be the Condition of the whole Covenant. For you make it to include Obedience : and what doth the Covenant require more than Faith and Obedience ?

2. Of Juſtification begun, and Juſtification continued and conſummated by ſentence at Judgment, I have ſpoken before, nor is there need here to ſay any more of it.

Ibid. 1. No doubt the Holy Ghoſt means as he ſpeaks : But what of that ? Doth he ſpeak ſo as you interpret him ?

2. Though our Divines in expounding the words of St. *James*, expreſs themſelves diverſly, yet they agree in the Matter, *viz.* That Works do not concur with Faith unto Juſtification.

Of the Coven. *p.* 64. Mr. *Ball* ſpeaking of thoſe words, [Faith is imputed unto Righteouſneſs] ſaith, [*This Paſſage is diverſly interpreted by Orthodox Divines, all aiming at the ſame Truth, and meeting in the Main, being rather ſeveral Expreſſions of the ſame Truth, than different Interpretations*].

Then he ſhews three ſeveral ways whereby thoſe words are interpreted, which differ as much as theſe Interpretations which you mention. They that ſay, That the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of Juſtification *coram Deo*, by Works, underſtand a Working-Faith : They that expound it of Juſtification *coram Hominibus*, take the meaning to be, That by Works a Man doth appear to be juſtified. They that underſtand it of the Juſtification of the Perſon, make the ſenſe the ſame with thoſe firſt mentioned : and they that ſay it is meant of the Juſtification of a Man's Faith, agree with thoſe in the ſecond place, making Works to prove the ſincerity of Faith, and ſo to manifeſt a Man's Juſtification.

3. Are not thoſe words [*Hoc eſt Corpus meum*] as expreſs words of Scripture, as thoſe which you alledg ? Though words be never ſo expreſs, yet not only τὸ ῥητὸν, but alſo ἡ διάνοια is to be conſidered.

4. *James* might well and ſolidly prove by Works done many

many years after, that the Faith of *Abraham*, whereby he was justified, was a Working-Faith, of a Working Nature, a Faith fruitful in good Works, his Faith bringing forth such fruit in due season, and so shewing it self by Works when occasion did require. *Abraham* (no doubt) had many other Works, whereby his Faith did appear, yet the Apostle thought meet to instance in that Work, which was most remarkable; and by which his Faith did manifest it self in a more especial manner.

Hoc facinus (saith *Chrysostome*) *tanto praestantius erat caeteris omnibus, ut illa cum hoc collata nihil esse viderentur.* *In 2 Cor. 1 Hom. 3.*

What your Parenthesis doth mean (*Legal Justification I mean*) I do not well understand. But how doth *James* speak of Justification as Continued, and not as Begun? Is his meaning this, That a Man is indeed at first justified by Faith only, but both Faith and Works together do continue his Justification? So you understand it: but surely *James* doth neither speak, nor mean so. For by Faith alone without Works, in his sense, a Man never was, never can be justified. This is clear by his whole Discourse, for he calls him a vain Man that relies on such a Faith, and calls it a *dead Faith*, &c. So that when a Man is first justified, it is by a Working Faith: not that Faith must necessarily produce Works at the first, but it is (as I said) of a Working Nature, of such a Nature as to produce Works when they are required; which is the same with what you say out of *Grotius*: and this doth answer all that you object against the Interpretation which I stand for. Who can doubt but *Abraham* was justified long before he offered up *Isaac*, the Scripture being express for it? But how then? Therefore this Work could be no Condition of that Justification which was past.

Answ. No indeed, that Work was not, nor could be; but Faith apt to shew it self by that Work, or any other, when required, and consequently a Working Faith might be, and was the Condition of that Justification. *Grotius*, whom you cite, giving you such a hint of it, I wonder that you could not observe this. *James* and *Paul* may well enough be reconciled, though both of them speak of Justification as Begun. For *James* doth not require Works otherwise than as Fruits of Faith, to be

brought forth in time convenient: and *Paul* doth not exclude Works in that sense.

Of Justifying-Faith, §. 2. chap. 17. [*Every observant Reader* (saith Dr. *Jackson*) *may furnish himself with plenty of Arguments all demonstrative, that Works taken as St.* James *meant, not for the Act or Operation only, but either for the Act, or promptitude to it, are necessary to Justification*, &c.]

Ibid. And again, [*Faith virtually includes the same mind in us that was in Christ, a readiness to do Works of every kind, which notwithstanding are not Associates of Faith in the business of Justification*].

Ibid. And thus he reconcileth the two Apostles, who in this Point seem to differ, [*St.* James *affirming we are justified by Works, and not by Faith only, speaks of the Passive Qualification in the Subject, or Party to be justified, or made capable of absolute Approbation, or final Absolution. This qualification supposed, St.* Paul *speaks of the Application of the Sentence, or of the ground of the Plea for Absolution: the one* (*by his Doctrine*) *must be conceived, and the other sought for only by Faith. The immediate and only cause of both he still contends not to be in us, but without us: and for this reason, when he affirms that we are justified by Faith alone, he considers not Faith as it is a part of our qualification inherent, or the foundation of other Graces, but as it includes the Correlative Term, or Immediate Cause of Justification, whereunto it alone hath peculiar reference, and continual aspect. This is that which in other terms some have delivered,* Fides justificat relative, non * effective, aut formaliter, &c.]

* *Not that Faith hath no efficiency at all in Justifying, but that it is not the Meritorious Cause of Justification.*

Take a few words more from this Author, (*Ibid.*) [*The Apostle levels his whole Discourse to this Point maintained by us, That seeing Righteousness was imputed to* Abraham *by Faith, and not through Works, none after him should in this life at any time,* (*N. B.*) *whether before or after the infusion of Grace, or Inherent Righteousness, presume to seek or hope for like approbation from God otherwise than only by Faith*].

How

How I exclude Love, I have shewed, even as you do, *viz.* Love of Complacency, which you grant doth follow Acceptance, that Act of Faith by which we are justified. And when I say that Protestants generally deny Faith, which is without Works to justifie, I mean Faith which is without works when God doth call for them. You might easily have perceived this to be my meaning by what I said out of *Cajetan de fide non sterili, sed facunda operibus.* A Tree is not said to be barren, except it doth not bring forth Fruit when the Season doth require.

5. I shewed you what I take to be meant *Jam.* 2. 23. when it is said, [*And the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith,* Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteousness*]; *viz.* That by *Abraham*'s readiness to obey God in offering up *Isaac*, the truth of that Scripture did clearly appear, it was then most manifest, That *Abraham* believed God indeed, and that his Faith was a true Justifying-Faith, it being operative, and shewing forth it self so evidently by Works of Obedience, when they were required of him; so that the Scripture did well and truly say of him, That he *believed God, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness.*

Cajetan doth explicate it (me-thinks) very well. *Adverte* (saith he) *prudens Lector, quòd* Jacobus *non sentit fidem absque operibus mortuam esse, &c. Sed sentit fidem sine operibus, id est, renuentem operari, esse mortuam, esse vanam, & non justificantem. Et rectè sentit, quoniam, quæ non est parata operari, mortua est. Suâpte enim naturâ operatur per dilectionem, ut* Paulus *dicit. Quod ergo* Jacobus *affert verba,* Gen. 15. [*Credidit* Abraham *Deo, &c.*] *ad hoc affert, quod credidit paratus operari. Et propterea dicit, quod in opere oblationis filii impleta est Scriptura loquens de fide* Abrahæ *parata operari. Impleta, inquam, est quoad executionem maximi operis, ad quod parata erit fides* Abrahæ. *In Loc.*

And though you make light of this interpretation of *James*, as if it were nothing against you; yet *Calvin* doubted not to say, *Nodo insolubili constrictos teneo, quicunque justitiam* Abrahæ *coram Deo imputatam fingunt, quia immolavit filium* Isaac, *qui nondum natus erat, quum Spiritus Sanctus pronunciat justum fuisse* Abraham. *Itaque necessario restat, ut aliquid posterius notari* *In Loc.*

tari discamus. Quomodo igitur Jacobus *id fuisse impletum dicit? Nempe ostendere vult, qualis illa fuerit fides, quæ justificavit* Abraham, *non otiosa scilicet, aut evanida, sed quæ illum Deo reddidit obsequentem; sicut etiam* Heb. 11. 8. *habetur.*

* He is express against it. *Instit. l. 3. c. 17. §. 9.* Of the Coven. *c. 12. 79, 80*

Calvin (it seems) never dreamed of being justified one way at first, * and another way afterwards. I would not have you put him off with a taunt, as you did before. *Rarcius ista tamen, &c.*

But let Mr. *Blake* also be heard speak, [James *indeed* (saith he) *saith that* Abraham *was justified by Works, when he had offered* Isaac *his Son on the Altar,* Jam. 2. 21. *But either there we must understand a Working-Faith with* Piscator, Pareus, Pemble, *&c. and confess that* Paul *and* James *handle two distinct Questions, the one, Whether Faith alone justifies without Works? which he concludes in the Affirmative. The other, What Faith justifies, whether a Working-Faith only, and not a Faith that is dead & idle? Or else I know not how to make sense of the Apostle, who straight infers from* Abraham's *Justification by the offer of his Son; And the Scripture was fulfilled, that saith,* Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness. *How otherwise do these accord? He was justified by Works, and the Scripture was fulfilled, that saith, He was justified by Faith? Neither can I reconcile what he saith, if this be denied, with the whole current of the Gospel*].

And he adds a little after, [*All Works before or after Conversion, are inherent in us, or wrought by us, are excluded from Justification*].

Your Interpretations, *viz.* [*Abraham believed,* i. e. *believed and obeyed*]. Or, [*Yet the Scripture was fulfilled,* &c. *For Faith did justifie him, but not only Faith*]. are so uncouth and incongruous, that I wonder how you could perswade your self, much more think to perswade others to embrace them. *Paul* cites those words to prove that *Abraham* was justified only by Believing, and that Justification is by Faith only: And shall we admit of such an interpretation, [*Faith doth justifie, but not only?*] Or [*Abraham was justified by Believing and Obeying?*] What is this else but to make the Scripture a nose of wax, and to wrest it which way we please? Yea; What is it else but to make the Scripture plainly to contradict it

self?

ſelf? And yet (forſooth) you pretend to ſtand upon the τὸ ῥητὸν, and the plain words of Scripture. But *Paul* (you ſay) ſpeaks of Juſtification as Begun; and that (you grant) is by Faith only? Well, and for proof of his Doctrine (ſay I) he alledgeth the words of *Moſes* concerning *Abraham*. Muſt not thoſe words then be underſtood of the ſame Juſtification? Will you ſay with *Bellarmine*, that *Paul* ſpeaking of the firſt Juſtification, doth fetch a proof from the ſecond? As on the other ſide, he ſaith, that *James*, ſpeaking of the ſecond Juſtification, doth fetch a proof from the firſt? This is *Cœlum Terræ miſcere, & Mare Cœlo.*

6. For my interpretation of *Jam.* 2. 22. I did not only affirm it to be ſo, but alſo ſhewed where the ſame phraſe is ſo uſed, *viz.* 2 Cor. 12. 9. And I find that Orthodox Writers do parallel thoſe places, and interpret the one by the other.

Thus *Camero*; *Fides* (*inquit*) *dicitur perfici operibus, quia Fides, dum producit opera, oſtendit quàm ſit perfecta: ut* 2 Cor. 12. 9. *Virtus Chriſti dicitur perfici in infirmitatibus, quia tum ſcilicet ſe maximè exerit, & prodit.* *Myroth. ad Jac. 2. 22.*

And ſo *Maccovius*; *Fides fuit perfecta ex operibus, quomodo virtus Chriſti perficitur in infirmitate,* 2 Cor. 12. 9. *quia in eâ ſe exerit: conſimili ratione Fides perfici per opera dicitur, quia per ea ſe prodit.* *De Juſtif. Diſp.* 10.

Generally I find the words thus expounded by thoſe that either comment upon them, or have occaſion to treat of them.

Dicitur ex operibus (ſaith *Calvin*) *fuiſſe perfecta, non quòd inde ſuam perfectionem accipiat, ſed quòd vera eſſe inde comprobetur.* *In Loc.*

So *Beza*; *Hoc igitur* (*inquit*) *ad declarationem quoque pertinet. Fides enim eo perfectior dicitur, quo plenius perſpecta eſt, ac cognita, & quo efficacius vires ſuas exerit quæ prius non ita apparebant.* *In Loc.*

Fulke doth cite *Beda* thus expounding it; [*His Faith was perfected by his Deeds, that is, by perfect execution of Works it was proved to be in his Heart*]. *Perfecta, i. e. perfectius cognita.* Tremell. *ad Loc.*

Thus alſo *Lud. de Dieu*, *Quatenus bona opera vitam fidei, ejuſque vim, efficaciam, ſinceritatem produnt, adeoque eam illuſtrant & exornant, rectè dicuntur perfectio Fidei.* *In Loc.*

And

Symphon. Cathol. Cap. 36. Thesi 2.

And so *Polanus*; *Fides justificans perficitur ex bonis operibus, non quoad actum seu essentiam & constitutionem suam, sed quatenus per ea firmatur, manifestatur, comprobatur; sicut res aliqua tum fieri dicitur, quum patefit.*

Fides dicitur perfici per opera, quia per ea se prodit Rivet. *Disp. de Fide Justif. §. 20.*

And he cites the Interlineary Gloss upon *Jam. 2. Per opera fides est augmentata & comprobata.*

And *Lyra*; *Et ex operibus fides consummata est. Habitus enim firmatur & manifestatur per opera. Et similiter magnitudo fidei* Abrahæ *apparuit ex ejus obedientia offerendo filium, propter quod dictum fuit sibi à Domino; Nunc cognovi, &c.*

Of Faith, Part 1. c. 4. p. 44.

Thus also Mr. *Ball*, [*Faith is perfected by Works, not that the Nature of Faith receiveth complement or perfection from Works, but because it doth declare and manifest it self by Love and good Works, and is esteemed so much the more perfect, as the Works produced are the more excellent*].

Animad. pag. 54. *Where I also cited Dr* Preston *thus expounding it, and using this similitude to illustrate it.*

To illustrate this, I used also the Similitude of a Tree, the goodness of whose Fruit doth but manifest the goodness of it; and so the power of Faith doth but appear by its fruits, *viz.* Works. You say that Faith is really perfected by Works, as a Tree is by bearing fruit. But (as our Saviour saith) *a Tree is known by his Fruit.* The Fruit doth not make the Tree good, but only shew it to be so. And this very Similitude have Learned Divines used to this purpose.

Ubi supra.

Beza immediately after the words before cited adds, *Ut si dicatur alicujus arboris bonitas tum fuisse perfecta, quum optimum aliquem fructum edidit. Nam quis de causâ judicamus ex effectis, videtur quodammodo causa vis vel minui, vel augeri ex effectorum proportione. Sed hoc ex effectis intelligitur quidem, & æstimatur, non autem emanat.*

So Mr. *Ball*, [*How then saith the Apostle that Faith is perfected by Works? As we judg of the Cause by the Effects, and by the proportion of the Effects the efficacy and force of the Cause may seem to be increased or diminished. Every thing is acknowledged to be perfect, when it worketh, and is esteemed so much the more perfect, by how much the more it worketh: As we say the goodness of a Tree is perfect, when it hath brought forth some excellent good Fruit. Thus Philosophers teach, That the Form*

Form is not perfect, when it is considered as the first Act, but when it is taken as the second Act; for by working it putteth forth its force, and declareth it self. And so Faith is perfected by Works, &c.] as before cited.

You say also, That Faith is really perfected by Works, as a Covenant or Promise is by Performance. But the Performance doth only manifest the perfection of a Covenant or Promise. It is a perfect Covenant or Promise, as soon as it is made, if it be made sincerely and without guile, though it appears more fully to be so when it is performed. Again you say, That Faith is really perfected by Works, as it hath *naturam medii, viz.* Conditionis, to the Continuation and Consummation of Justification. But you have not yet proved, That there is any other Condition of Justification as Continued and Consummated, than of Justification as Begun.

Apprehensio illa fidei habet fluxum suum continuum, &c. (saith *Rivet*) *Quod continuum beneficium fide apprehensum, si secundam Justificationem appellare velint adversarii, imò tertiam, quartam, quintam, & millesimam, non repugnamus, dummodo constet nullâ aliâ ratione (N. B.) nos justificari à peccatis sequentibus, quàm eâ, quâ semel justificati fuimus à precedentibus.* *In Gen. 15 Exercit. 73.*

St. *James* doth not speak of Works perfecting Faith more to the continuing and consummating of Justification, than to the beginning of it. For (which must ever be remembred) he speaks of Faith as *apta nata operari:* and such a Faith is requisite, that we may be justified as well at first as afterward. Otherwise Works neither at first nor afterward do concur with Faith to our Justification.

[*A preparation or promptitude of Heart* (saith Mr. *Ball*) *to good Works, is an effect of Faith as immediate as Justification*]. Of Faith, Part 1. c. 4. p. 57.

And again, [*Faith doth not begin to apprehend Life, and leave the accomplishment to Works, but doth rest upon the Promise of Life until we come to enjoy it*]. *Ib.* Part 2. c. 4. p. 253.

Yet again you say, That Faith is really perfected by Works, as Works are a part of that necessary Matter (not necessary at the first moment of Believing, but necessary afterward, when we are called to it) whereby we are justified

juſtified againſt the Charge of non-performance of the New-Covenants Condition, even againſt the Charge of being an Unbeliever or an Hypocrite. But all this proves not that Works give any perfection to Faith, but only that they ſhew the perfection, *i. e.* the ſincerity, force, and efficacy of it. Works may manifeſt a Man to be no Unbeliever or Hypocrite: but it is his Faith, which being unfained, doth indeed make him to be no Unbeliever or Hypocrite. All therefore that you have ſaid, makes nothing againſt my interpretation of thoſe words, *Jam.* 2. 22. [And by Works was Faith made perfect].

7. Your ſelf deny *neceſſitatem præſentiæ operum* in reſpect of our being juſtified at firſt. And for the Conducibility of Works to the effect of Juſtification, *James* ſpeaketh not of it, but only ſhews, that Juſtifying Faith is not without Works, *viz.* when God doth call for them. He ſhews that Juſtifying-Faith is a Working-Faith, a Faith ready to Work when occaſion doth require: But that Works do therefore conduce unto Juſtification as well as Faith, he doth not ſhew, neither doth this any way follow upon the other. A Working-Faith is the Condition of Juſtification, *i. e.* Faith which is of ſuch a nature as to bring forth the Fruit of good Works in due ſeaſon: yet are we not therefore juſtified by Works as well as by Faith. For we are juſtified by Faith only apprehending Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs; though the ſame Faith that doth this, will alſo produce good Works, as *Abraham*'s Faith did. That Works do juſtifie the Faith, but not the Perſon, though I uſe not to ſpeak ſo, yet I think may be ſaid without any implication of Contradiction. It is true, *Juſtificatio cauſæ eſt etiam Juſtificatio perſonæ, non ſimpliciter & abſolutè, ſed quoad iſtam cauſam*: but they that uſe that diſtinction mean (I think) only this, that Works ſhew Faith to be ſound and good, yet it is Faith and not Works, by which a Man is ſimply and abſolutely juſtified. Do not (I pray) here lay hold on the word [*abſolutely*]; it is referred to the word [*juſtified*] not to the word [*Faith*]. I do not ſay, That Faith abſolutely conſidered doth juſtifie: no, it doth juſtifie as it is conſidered relatively; Faith, *i. e.* Chriſt apprehended by Faith, is that whereby we are abſolutely juſtified. Though Works may juſtifie againſt the Accuſation of being a final non-performer of the condition (ſo

Fides ſola juſtificat, quia ipſa eſt unicum inſtrumentum, & unica facultas, in nobis quâ recipimus juſtitiam, Chriſti. Bucan. *Loc.* 31. *ad quæſt.* 37.

(so I would say, not Conditions, in respect of the Justification of which we speak) of the New Covenant; yet do they not therefore simply and absolutely justifie, but only against that Accusation, shewing that a Man did perform the Condition, *viz.* believe, and so is simply and absolutely justified, not by Works (which do but only declare him to be so) but by Faith, as the Condition or Instrument (for I will use the terms promiscuously, as others do) of Justification. Faith doth not justifie as Working, *i. e.* as bringing forth the Fruit of good Works; your self deny this in respect of our Justification at first: yet Faith doth not justifie, except it be of a Working-Nature, *i. e.* of such a Nature as to work when God calls for it. More than this cannot be inferred from *Jam.* 24. as is clear by the Context.

1. All Works, if good, are Works of the Law, *viz.* the Moral Law, which (as I said in the *Animadversions*) is the eternal Rule of Righteousness. And of that Law the Apostle speaks, when he excludes Works from Justification, as appears by his Reasons which he useth for proof of his Assertion, *Rom.* 3.20. *Gal.* 3.10. 63.

Evangelii (*inquit* Maccovius) *nulla sunt opera bona distincta à Lege formaliter. Adversaris cum urgentur, ex operibus legis non justificari hominem, admittunt hoc, & dicunt, ita quidem esse, sed non proinde non justificari operibus Evangelii. Hinc distinguunt inter opera Legis & Evangelii. Sed si obtineat hac distinctio, tum utique dabuntur etiam peccata, quæ committuntur * in Doctrinam Evangelii: Non ergo erit adæquata definitio peccati, quam dat Spiritus Sanctus,* 1 Joh. 3.4. *quòd peccatum sit Legis transgressio. —— At Evangelium distinguitur à Lege. Certè; interim Evangelis Doctrina præcipitur Lege. Nam Deus postulat, ut Evangelio credamus, &c.* *Thes. Theolog.* Part 1. Disp. 16.

* *Nempe Solam, & non etiam in Doctrinam Legis.*

So *Pemble*, [*Nor yet* (saith he) *hath this Distinction* (viz. *Works of the Law, and Works of the Gospel*) *any ground in Scripture, or in Reason. For both tell us, That the Works commanded in the Law, and Works commanded in the Gospel, are one and the same for the substance of them. What Work can be named, that is enjoyned us in the New Testament, which is not commanded us in that summary Precept of the Moral Law,* Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, Of Justif. Sect. 2. Chap. 2. §. 1.

Heart, and with all thy Soul, &c. *What is there againſt the Goſpel, which is not a tranſgreſſion of the Law?* — *You will ſay, It doth not command Faith in Chriſt. I anſwer, Yea, it doth. For that which commands us in general to believe what-ever God ſhall propoſe unto us, commands us alſo to believe in Chriſt, as ſoon as God ſhall make known that it is his Will we ſhould believe in him. The Goſpel diſcovers to us the Object, the Law commands us the obedience of believing it*].

The Moral Law may be ſaid to be a part of the New Covenant, as it requireth that they which have believed, be careful to maintain good works, *Tit.* 3. 8, 14. and to walk circumſpectly (ἀκριβῶς *accuratè, i. e. quam proximè ad Legis Dei præcepta*, as *Beza* doth well expound it), *Epheſ.* 5. 15. But this is far, and very far too from proving Works to have a co-intereſt with Faith in the effect of juſtifying. For your Reaſons why the Apoſtle doth not exclude all Works abſolutely from Juſtification, I ſee no ſtrength in them; and therefore I anſwer;

Ad Loc.

Ad 1. That which you call Juſtification againſt the Accuſation of final Unbelief, is indeed *Juſtification* againſt the Accuſation of Tranſgreſſing the whole Law. For that Accuſation being only made void by Faith, where there is final Unbelief, there that Accuſation hath its full force. Beſides, though the Accuſation of final Unbelief may be proved to be falſe by Works, yet Works upon this account do no otherwiſe juſtifie, than by manifeſting a Man's Faith, by which Faith indeed, and not by Works he is juſtified.

Ad 2. So alſo that Juſtification which *James* ſpeaketh of, is againſt a true Charge, and the ſame with *Remiſſion* of ſins, as well as that which *Paul* doth ſpeak of. For can they that have but a dead *Faith*, be juſtified againſt a true Charge and have their ſins remitted? Surely it muſt be a Living and a Working *Faith*, ſuch as *James* doth require, can work that Effect. Juſtification againſt a falſe Accuſation, is but ſuch a Juſtification as the worſt of Men and the Devils themſelves are capable of.

De Juſtif. c. 3. §. 11. *Nemo enim iniquus adeò*, (as *Bradſhaw* ſpeaketh) *aut injuſtus dari poteſt, qui falſò accuſari, & conſequenter etiam eatenus merito juſtificari non poſſit.*

Indeed Juſtification againſt the Accuſation of final Unbelief, is by conſequence a Juſtification againſt all Accu-

Accusations, because *Faith* is the Condition and Instrument of Universal Justification. But hence it follows that we are justified universally by *Faith*, and not by *Works*, which are only an Argument *à posteriori* of *Faith*, and so of Justification.

Ad 3. All Works that have a co-interest with *Faith* in Justification, are Competitors with Christ, or Copartners with him; so that Justification must be partly by the Righteousness of Christ through *Faith*, and partly by *Works*.

Ad 4. As the Righteousness of Christ is freely given or imputed at first upon condition of *Faith*, so is the free gift and imputation of it still continued upon the same condition of *Faith*; which *Faith* both when Justification is first begun, and when it is continued, must be a *Working-Faith*, *i. e.* ready to work as occasion doth require. If our Divines affirm, That the Apostle speaking against Justification by Works, means in point of merit, (as you say you could bring multitudes of them to this purpose) surely it is, because they know no other Justification by Works, but that which doth presuppose Works to be meritorious.

Hear one whom I (and so I presume you also) take for a good Divine, *viz.* Mr. *Blake*, [*This Justification* (saith he) *wrought freely by Grace through Faith*, Rom. 3. 24. *is no way consistent with Justification by Works. And what the Apostle speaks of Election, we may well apply to Justification: the same medium equally proves the truth of both; If by Grace, then it is no more of Works, otherwise Grace were no more Grace: But if it be of Works, then it is no more of Grace, otherwise Works were no more Works*, Rom. 11. 6.] Of the Coven. c. 12. p. 80.

Calvin also useth this Argument to confute those who would have Works to concur with *Faith* unto Justification, that then we should have somewhat to boast of, which is not to be admitted. *Sed quoniam* (*inquit*) *bona pars hominum justitiam ex fide & operibus compositam imaginatur, præmonstremus id quoque, sic inter se differre fidei operumque justitiam, ut altera stante necessario altera evertatur. Dicit Apostolus se omnia pro stercoribus reputasse, ut Christum lucrifaceret*, &c. (Phil. 3. 8, 9.) *Vides & contrariorum esse hic comparationem, & indicari propriam justitiam oportere pro derelicto habere* *Instit.* l. 3. c. 11. §. 13.

haberi ab eo, qui velit Christi justitiam obtinere.—Id ipsum quoque ostendit, cum negat per Legem excludi gloriationem nostram, sed per fidem. Unde sequitur, quantisper manet quantulacunque operum justitia, manere nobis nonnullam gloriandi materiam. Jam si fides omnem gloriationem excludit, cum justitiâ fidei sociari nullo pacto justitia operum potest. In hunc sensum tam clarè loquitur quarto cap. ad Rom. *ut nullum cavillis aut tergiversationibus locum relinquat. Si operibus, inquit, justificatus est* Abraham, *habet gloriam. Subjungit, atque non habet gloriam apud Deum. Consequens ergo est, non justificatum esse operibus. Ponit deinde alterum argumentum à contrariis. Quum redditur operibus merces, id fit ex debito, non ex gratiâ. Fidei autem tribuitur justitia secundum gratiam. Ergo id non est ex meritis operum. Valeat igitur eorum somnium, (N.B.) qui justitiam ex fide & operibus conflatam comminiscuntur.*

Who those multitudes of Divines be of whom you speak, I cannot tell, because you name none; but I think that few or none of them will be found of your mind, *viz.* That *Paul* doth only exclude Works from Justification in point of merit; as if Justification might be by Works in some other respect, so as that no merit thereby is presupposed. So far as I observe, our Divines note this as one main Argument, whereby the Apostle doth wholly exclude Works from Justification, because otherwise the merit of Works could not be denied, which yet is to be exploded.

Cent. 1. *Lib.* 2. *c.* 4. *Col.* 257. *Arg.* 26. Thus the *Centuriists* among many other Arguments, whereby the Apostles (they say) prove Justification to be by *Faith* alone, note this for one; *Non est gloriandum in nobis, sed in Domino. Ergo non ex operibus, sed gratis justificamur, ne quis glorietur,* Ephes. 2. 1 Cor. 1.

Ad 5. All good Works (as I have shewed before) and consequently those whereby we perform obedience to the Redeemer, are works of the Law, it being the Rule to which they must be conformed. But it is *Faith* in the Redeemer, not Obedience to the Redeemer, by which we are justified, though *Justifying-Faith* must, and will shew it self by Obedience.

Ad 6. All Works that have an agency in Justification, are meritorious, and so make the Reward to be of Debt, and

and not of Grace. Now to your Answers to my Arguments in *oppositum* I reply; And for the first thus; If *Abraham*'s Gospel-Works did justifie him otherwise than by evidencing his Faith, whereby he was justified, if they be made to have a co-interest with Faith in his Justification, then they are set in Competition or Copartnership with Christs Righteousness.

That no Work of the Gospel doth justifie; Mr. *Pemble* proveth by this, That every Work of the Gospel, is a Work of the Law also; and therefore the Apostle denying that a Man is justified by the Works of the Law, doth consequently deny that he is justified by the Works of the Gospel. That Works do justifie as Conditions under Christ, is repugnant to what your self hold in respect of Justification as begun: and I see not, that the Scripture shews us any other Condition of Justification afterward than at first. Of Justif. §. 2. ch. 2. §. 2. See *Rivet* as cited pag. 145.

2. My Conclusion, That *Abraham* was not justified by Works, but by Faith, is not against *Jam.* 2. 21. no more than *Paul*'s Doctrine *Rom.* 3. & 4. is. For I mean, as *Paul* doth, That *Abraham*'s Works did not concur with his Faith to his Justification: but *James* meant only, That *Abraham*'s Faith was not such as some presume of a dead idle Faith, but a living working Faith; and that his Works did manifest his Faith to be such as whereby he was justified.

Cum obtulisset (*inquit* Bucanus) Abraham Isaac *filium suum super altare, ex operibus justificatus est, hoc est, compertus est fuisse justificatus per fidem, idque ex operibus tanquam testimonio Justificationis. Et sic homo operibus justificatur, id est, comprobatur esse illa persona, quæ Christi obedientiâ justificatur, ex vitæ sanctificatione quæ tanquam effectus illam sequitur, & de illa testatur. Quomodo etiam Deus dicitur in extremo illo die justificaturus electos suos ex ipsorum operibus. Nam sunt duo principia, unum existentiæ, alterum cognitionis. Ita fides principium existentiæ facit, ut simus justi. Opera autem ut principium cognitionis faciunt, ut cognoscamur justi. Ideo Dominus in extremo die proponet principium cognitionis justitiæ fidei, quod incurret in oculos omnium creaturarum*, Mat. 25. *Venite benedicti*, &c. *Loc. Com. Loc.* 31. *ad quæst.* 39.

For the second; 1. The Apostle *Rom.* 4. 4. speaketh without any distinction, *To him that worketh*, &c. Now (as you know) *non est distinguendum, ubi lex non distinguit.*

2. If Works justifie, then they must be meritorious. The Apostle doth not simply deny a Reward to belong of Grace to him that worketh, but to him that worketh so as to be justified by his Works. Such an one having no need of remission of sins, because his Works do justifie him, (which they cannot do if they be imperfect, and so he need pardon) he is said to receive the Reward, not of Grace, but of Debt.

* *Fides non justificat quatenus est opus justitiæ, sed quatenus apprehendit justitiam Christi.* Rivet. *Disput. de Fide Justif.* Sect. 19.

3. Faith as a * Work is excluded from Justification, only it justifieth as an Instrument or Hand receiving Christ and his Righteousness. Or (which is to the same effect) Faith doth not justifie, as it is a Duty, which if we perform not we sin; but as a Condition upon which the Righteousness of Christ is imputed unto us for our Justification. You are not to be blamed for making use of *Bellarmine*'s Argument, (for so indeed it is, not his Answer) but for not taking notice how our Divines do answer it. See *Amesius contra. Bellar. tom.* 4. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 4. *ad* 6. Love, Hope, and Obedience are not Instruments of receiving Christ, as Faith is; neither doth the Scripture make them Conditions of Justification, as it doth Faith.

Fides sola justificat, quæ ipsa est unicum instrumentum, & unica facultas in nobis, quâ recipimus justitiam Christi. Bucan. *Loc.* 31. *ad quæst.* 37.

For the Third; 1. Neither doth *James* speak of any other Justification.

2. The imperfection of *Faith* proves that none are justified by it, as a Work or Duty, but only as apprehending Christ and his Righteousness; See *Calv. Instit. lib.* 3. *cap.* 11. §. 7. And *Pemble* of *Justif. Sect.* 2. *chap.* 2. *pag.* 38.

3. No more do the greatest Transgressors need pardon for that wherein they do not transgress.

4. Works

4. Works as Works either justifie by way of merit, or not at all: But *Faith* doth not justifie as a Work or Duty required of us, but as an Instrument receiving Christ, or (if you will) a Condition whereby we are made partakers of Christ's Righteousness, by which we are justified; See *Pemble* of *Justif.* §. 2. *chap.* 1. *pag.* 24.

The Exclusion (*viz.* of VWorks from being concurrent with Faith unto Justification) is not only Mr. *Pemble*'s, but generally all Protestants, and indeed *Paul*'s and the Scriptures: and to take in VWorks (in that sense) is as Mr. *Blake* before cited truly saith, against the whole current of the Gospel. 64.

1. To deny the Scripture to mean as you interpret it, is not to deny it to mean as it speaketh. Whether the Reasons which I alledged against your interpretation of St. *James* be forced, let others judg. *Ibid.* & 67.

2. It avails your cause nothing to prove, That *James* by working doth mean VWorks indeed. I presume Mr. *Pemble* would not deny that, but his meaning (I conceive) was, That VWorks are only spoken of as Fruits of Justifying *Faith*, and are only said to justifie, because they are (as Dr. *Jackson* speaketh) a passive qualification in the Subject or Party to be justified.

[*Hence* (saith he also) *is the seeming inconvenience of St.* James *his Causal form of Speech* (ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος) *easily answered. For the immediate and principal cause proposed, it is usual to attribute a kind of causality to the qualification of the Subject, though only requisite as a mere passive disposition, without which the principal or sole Agent shall want his efficacy*]. Of Justifying Faith, §. 2. *ch.* 17. §. 7.

All that St. *James* intended is this, That Justifying *Faith* is of a VWorking-Nature, and not such a *Faith* as some rely on, *viz.* barren and without VWorks. Now for your Reasons, I answer, *Ad* 1. You speak of the unprofitableness of bare *Faith*, *i. e.* (say you) Assent. But *quorsum hoc?* You know that Protestants make *Faith* to justifie, not as it is a bare Assent, but as it is a Receiving of Christ, and a Recumbency on him.

Fides hac justificans (saith *Ames.*) *non est illa generalis, quâ in intellectu assensum præbemus veritati in sacris literis revelatæ, &c. Fides igitur illa proprie dicitur justificans, quâ incumbimus in Christum ad remissionem* *Medull. lib.* 1. *c.* 27. §. 15, 16.

peccatorum, & salutem. And this *Faith* they hold is not barren, but fruitful in good VVorks; though not VVorks, but *Faith* it self (apprehending and applying Christ) be it, whereby we are justified.

Disp. de Fide Just. §. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22. *Id fidei exclusivè tribuendum ex eo constat, quod sola est fides, quæ Deo promittenti credit, quæ sola acquiescit in gratuitâ promissione Dei in Christo, & remissionem peccatorum apprehendit, &c. Unde etiam sequitur, Fidem non justificare, quatenus est opus justitiæ, sed quatenus apprehendit justitiam Christi, &c. Nec* Jacobus *dissentit à* Paulo, *quamvis alio modo loquendi utatur, ut redarguat eos, qui sespsos fallebant inani fidei justificationem tribuentes, quam probat non esse veram ab exemplo Charitatis, quæ nullam vim habet, si tota sit in verbis, c. 2. 16. Operibus autem justificari apud* Jacobum, *idem est, quod apud* Paulum, *1 Tim. 3. 16. justificari spiritu, i. e. Vi spiritus dare sui experimentum, quomodo experimentum dedit* Abraham *fidei suæ, offerendo filium suum: & homo probatus sit,* δόκιμος, *tentatione,* Jac. 1. 12. *quæ probatio non facit ut res sit, sed per experientiam docet rem esse. Unde etiam fides dicitur perfici per opera, quia per ea se prodit. Ergo cum* Paulo *vult* Jacobus, *hominem justificari fide, sed utergue eâ, quæ sui experimentum dat per opera: etsi neuter vult opera esse justificationis causas, aut ad justitiam coram Deo acceptari, quorum primum volunt Pontificii, alterum Socinians & Remonstrantes. Concludimus cum Apostolo, & colligimus, fide justificari hominem absque operibus Legis,* Rom. 3. 28. *sub quibus comprehendimus qualibet opera, quæ secundum Legem fiunt, etiam à sanctis & fidelibus. Cum enim inter Legem factorum sive operum, & Legem fidei distinguat Apostolus, ibid.* v. 27. *si ex operibus justificemur, Legis operum & fidei distinctio erit vana, & Argumentum ex eâ deductum pro fidei justificatione nutabit; quod absurdum ut vitemus, scientes non justificari hominem ex operibus Legis, sed tantum per fidem Jesu Christi; etiam nos in Jesum Christum credimus, ut justificemur ex fide Jesu Christi, non ex operibus Legis,* Gal. 2. 22. *Sed cum eodem Apostolo fidum esse hunc sermonem affirmamus studendum esse iis, qui crediderunt Deo, ut bona opera tueantur,* Tit. 3. 8. *ut purificemus nos ab omni inquinamento, &c.* 2 Cor. 7. 1. *quod cum fiat de die in diem,* 2 Cor. 4. 16. *quam-*

dix caro concupiscit adversus Spiritum, &c. Gal. 5. 17. *in eo non possumus coram Deo justificari. Nam in justificando partialem justitiam Deus non respicit, sed perfectam & plenam, quia Lex maledicit omnibus, qui non permanebunt in omnibus quæ præcipit,* Deut. 27. 26. Gal. 3. 10.

I have been the larger in citing this Author, both because he is eminent, and also doth speak so fully to the Point, and doth meet with many of your Opinions.

But to proceed, It is *Faith* and *Faith*, *i. e.* several kinds of *Faith*, which St. *James* opposeth one to the other, *viz.* *Faith* which is a bare Assent, and without Works, such a *Faith* as the Devils have, and *Faith* which is moreover an embracing of Christ, and the mercy of God in Christ, and is attended with VVorks as the Fruits and Effects of it, as the *Faith* of *Abraham* and *Rahab* was. Though therefore he concludes, That *Faith* cannot save him that hath not VVorks, yet it follows not that VVorks concur with *Faith* unto Justification, but only that a Justifying *Faith* will shew it self by VVorks.

Ad 2. It is granted, That *Faith* which is no more than a bare Assent, is neither Justifying nor Saving: But what of this? Is there no other *Faith* than Assent? Do not you your self make Acceptance, which is more than Assent, the compleating Act of Justifying *Faith*? And how can you say, That there is the same force ascribed to VVorks as to *Faith*, when you make Justification at first to be by *Faith* without VVorks? Indeed VVorks are requisite in their place, but not as having the like force with *Faith* unto Justification, (shew any Orthodox VVriter that doth hold so) though as necessary Fruits of that *Faith*, by which we are justified. Say not that you speak of Justification as continued, for VVorks, as St. *James* doth speak of them, are as necessary unto Justification at first as afterward, *viz.* a promptitude and readiness to do good VVorks: if this be wanting, it is no Justifying *Faith*, but (as St. *James* calls it) *a dead Faith*, altogether vain and unprofitable.

Ad 3. That *Faith* without VVorks is a hardening of Unbelievers, I grant: *sed quid tum postea?* Do therefore VVorks justifie as well as *Faith*? But I do not think that St. *James* brings in (*chap.* 2. 18.) an Unbeliever so speaking. For how should an Unbeliever (a profes-

fed Unbeliever, we mean; for you use to distinguish betwixt an Unbeliever and an Hypocrite) speak of his *Faith*, saying, [*And I will shew thee my Faith?*]

In Loc. *Calvin* doth far better interpret it, saying, *Jacobus dicit, promptum fore pio sanctè viventibus, excutere hypocritis talem jactantiam, quâ inflati sunt.*

Ad 4. The Devils have a true Belief, *i. e.* a true Assent; but there is more than Assent in Justifying *Faith*, even that *Faith* whereby we are justified at first, as your self do hold. And you confess also that *Faith* doth justifie at first without VVorks; yet (say I) not except it be of a VVorking-Nature, *i. e.* ready to VVork, when VVorks are required: and otherwise than as Fruits of Justifying *Faith* VVorks do not justifie neither at first nor afterward.

Ad 5. Faith without VVorks is dead, as to the effect of Justification, even altogether unprofitable, *i. e.* Faith *venuens operari*, or which is not *parata operari*, as *Cajetan* doth well express it. But this is nothing to prove a *In Jac. 2.* Co-interest of VVorks with *Faith* in point of Justification; it only proves, That Justifying *Faith* is of a working Nature. VVhereas you add, [*Still here the opposite part on one side is Faith and Works, and on the other side Faith without Works*]; this doth nothing hinder, but that the opposition is (as I said) betwixt *Faith* and *Faith*, *i. e.* several kinds of *Faith*, whereof the one is accompanied with VVorks, and the other not; the one is operative and fruitful, the other idle & barren. That *Abraham* was justified not only by that *Faith* that did work, but also by VVorks, is more than St. *James* doth say, and is directly contradictory to what St. *Paul* saith. Indeed it is more than you can say, without your distinction of Justification Begun and Continued; which distinction St. *James* never thought of. For surely Justification cannot be at first by a dead and unprofitable Faith, as he affirms that to be, which is without VVorks. That in *Jam.* 2. 22. cannot be meant that Faith by VVorks is made perfect, as accomplishing its ends, but only as thereby declared and manifested to be perfect. The end of Faith is to justifie; and your self say, That Faith at first doth justifie without Works: so that in your Opinion Faith without VVorks is perfect, accomplishing its end in justifying at first. But in St. *James* his sense Faith doth not, cannot

at

at all justifie without VVorks, *i. e.* if it be not ready to work: and in that respect VVorks do perfect Faith, *i. e.* they make the perfection of Faith to appear: but of that enough before.

Ad 6. And so of that also in *Jam.* 2. 23. enough hath been said already. That Faith alone is the Condition of the Initiation; but Faith and Obedience of the Confirmation, Continuation, and Consummation of Justification, you often say, but never prove. Sure I am *James* doth exclude Faith, which is without VVorks, *viz.* when God doth call for them, from the very Initiation of Justification. For he makes such a Faith as unprofitable as the Faith of Devils, who surely are so far from Justification, that they have not so much as the initiation of it.

Ad 7. You can never make more of that Conclusion *Jam.* 2. 24. than that a Man is justified by a VVorking Faith, or by a Faith which produceth VVorks, and so by his VVorks appears to be justified. The words if taken without any qualification, are against your self, who will have a Man justified at first by Faith without VVorks. If you will distinguish of Justification as at first, and as afterward, to make the Apostle agree with your meaning, though indeed it will not serve: Shall not others have leave to explain the Apostle so, as to make him agree not only with them, but also with himself, and the whole current of the Gospel? The word μόνον there imports no more than if it had been μόνως, as appears by the whole series of the Discourse, and more particularly by v. 17. where καθ' ἑαυτὴν is as much as μόνη, [*by it self*] *i. e.* alone without the concomitancy of VVorks, as the Fruits of it. *Beza* renders it *per se*; *Tremellius* out of the *Syriack Sola*: the Vulgar Latin hath *in semetipsa*, which *Cajetan* corrects, saying, *pro per se*, and that he expounds, *hoc est sola*. VVherein I suppose he followed *Erasmus*, whose Annotation on the place is, καθ' ἑαυτὴν, *i. e. per se, hoc est, sola.*

Ad 8. *Rahab* was justified by VVorks so as *Abraham* was, and all must be, even when they are first justified, *viz.* by a Faith prompt and ready to work when occasion doth require.

Ad 9. Our Divines by Faith understand a Sound and Orthodox Belief, *i. e.* Assent; and such is the Faith of the Devils spoken of *Jam.* 2. 19. such a Faith may be

without VVorks, and so is dead, *i. e.* unprofitable: but that is not the Justifying Faith which our Divines do speak of, (as I have shewed before) who hold that Faith alone doth justifie without VVorks, though withal they hold that Faith which doth justifie is not alone without VVorks, *viz.* when God doth call for them; and this is all that St. *James* urgeth. Your own *Analysis* doth evince no more than this, save that now and then you put a wrong gloss upon the Text, and ever and anon come in with your distinction betwixt the Initiation and the Continuation of Justification, quite besides, yea and against St. *James* his meaning, as (I think) I have sufficiently demonstrated.

In Jac. 2. *Oecumenius* a Greek Scholiast doth expound St. *James*, and reconcile him with St. *Paul*, after the same manner as I and others do; Οὐκ ἀνῃρέσκει (saith he) ταυτα τῷ μακαρίῳ Παύλῳ, κατὰ δύο σημαινομένων τῦ τ πίστεως ὀνοματος ὑπειλημμένα. Sometimes (he saith) Faith is taken for a bare Assent, ἐπὶ τ ἁπλῆς συγκαταθέσεως, and so the Devils believe: Sometimes it notes also a disposition joyned with assent, τὴν ἐνδιάθετον ἐπακολουθοῦσαν μετὰ βεβαίας συγκαταθέσεως. St. *James* (he saith) considereth Faith in the former sense, St. *Paul* in the latter. Ἰάκωβος μὲν τὴν ἁπλῆν φησι συγκατάθεσιν νεκρὰν εἶναι, &c. Παῦλος δὲ τὴν ἐνδιάθετον λέγει, ἥτις ἐκ ἰσχύος ἰσχυρὰ μάλιστα.

To conclude, It is not Faith as working that doth justifie, but Faith as apprehending Christ and his Righteousness: Yet that Faith which doth apprehend Christ and his Righteousness, and so doth justifie, is a Working Faith. Your self grant that VVorks are not necessary *quoad praesentiam*, in respect of Justification as begun: and that they are necessary *quoad effectum justificationis*, in respect of Justification as continued, is more (I presume) than ever will be proved.

65, &c. 1. I let pass those things which you speak of *Calvin*, because I see nothing but bare words. As for *Clemens Rom. Ignatius, Justin Martyr*, and the rest, who for 1000 years after *Paul* (you say) give as much to Works as you ever did, or more, and make Faith to justifie as a Condition, and * not as an Instrument, what-ever forced scraps some may gather out of a Line against the

* *To make Faith to be a Condition, is not to deny it to be an Instrument: Our Divines sometimes term it the one way, sometimes the other, as I have before shewed.*

the full ſcope of the whole Page or Book; I wiſh you had cited ſome Books, or Pages, or but Scraps, as you call them, whereby to make good what you ſay, I am not of ſuch Reading, much leſs of ſuch Memory, as to give an account of ſo many Authors. Some of them either wholly or in part I have read, but I do not remember where they do *ex profeſſo* treat of Juſtification, and therefore I do not marvel if they do not ſpeak ſo accurately of it.

But for the Opinion of the Ancient VVriters in this Point, I ſhall refer you unto ſome who were much better verſed in them than I am, *viz. Fulk* on *Jam.* 2. 4. *Davenant de Juſtit. Habit. cap.* 25. where he anſwereth *Bellarmines* Allegations, and *cap.* 29. where he produceth his own.

And *Eckhard Compend. Theolog. Lib.* 2. *cap.* 3. who alledgeth *Chryſoſtome, Ambroſe, Baſil, Cyril, Auſtine* and *Bernard*, as holding Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to be imputed unto us for our Juſtification. And he alledgeth *Ambroſe, Hierome, Athanaſius, Clemens Alex. Origen, Nazianzen, Chryſoſtome, Baſil, Theodoret, Heſychius, Primaſius, Epiphanius, Philaſtrius, Auſtin, Sedulius, Maxentius, Theodulus, Fortunatus, Victor Mar.* and *Bernard*, as teſtifying that we are juſtified by Faith alone without VVorks; and yet he ſaith he doth but *aliquot ex vetuſtâ antiquitate teſtimonia, quod ad hanc rem ſpectat, delibare.*

Beda, omitted by *Eckhard*, is cited by B. *Uſher* as writing on *Pſal.* 77. thus, *Per juſtitiam factorum nullus ſalvabitur, ſed per ſolam juſtitiam fidei.* *De Statu & Succeſſ. &c. cap.* 2.

To your other Query concerning *Calvin, P. Martyr*, &c. I anſwer in the words of *Ameſius*, *Fides ſpecialis miſericordiæ duplici ratione ſic vocatur.* 1. *Quâ Chriſtum apprehendit, vel innititur ipſi ad ſpecialem miſericordiam per ipſum apprehendendam.* 2. *Quâ miſericordia ſpecialem jam donatam apprehendit: priore ſenſu juſtificationem antecedit, poſteriore ſenſu ſequitur juſtificationem. Sed quia una & eadem eſt fides, quæ miſericordiam Dei in Chriſto ſpecialiter applicat apprehendendo, & applicationem illam jam factam certam reddit, & perfectio vel conſolatio ejus in hâc certitudine apparet, quam etiam hoſtes gratiæ precipuè impugnant, idcirco per iſtam certitudinem (quæ tamen quoad ſenſum à fide* pag. 46. *Contra Bell. tom.* 4 *lib.* 5. *c.* 2. §. 22.

fide potest ad tempus separari) fides justificans solet à multis describi.

Medul. l. 1. c. 27. §. 19. And again, *Fides ista justificans suâ naturâ producit, atque adeò conjunctam secum habet specialem ac certam persuasionem de gratâ ac misericordiâ Dei in Christo. Unde etiam per istam persuasionem fides justificans non malè sæpè describitur ab Orthodoxis, præsertim cum impugnant generalem illam fidem, cui omnia tribuunt Pontificii. Sed 1. ista persuasio quoad sensum ipsius non semper adest. — 2. Varii sunt gradus hujus persuasionis, &c.*

2. By Apprehending, I do not mean bare Assent, but Embracing, or Receiving, or Applying.

Contra Bellar. loco proximè citato. *Amesius* cites and approves these words of *Contarenus*; *Accipimus justificationem per fidem. Hanc acceptationem* Thomas *in* 3. *appellat applicationem, inquiens passionem Christi esse veluti Medicinam communem, quam quisque sibi applicat per fidem & Sacramenta. Protestantes appellant apprehensionem, non eâ significatione, quæ pertinet ad cognitionem intellectus, sed qua illud dicimur apprehendere, quo pervenimus, & quod post motum nostrum attingimus.*

I think that although Justifying-Faith doth receive Christ intirely, yet as Justifying it receiveth him only in respect of his Satisfaction, which is the Righteousness by which we are justified. There is no danger in this Doctrine, so long as People are taught withal, that they must not look to have Christ as a Priest satisfying for them, except they also have him as a King reigning over them. Neither doth it seem to me any gross conceit, That apprehending or applying of Christ's Satisfaction, or of Christ as satisfying for us, is that act of Faith whereby we are justified. Your Similitude doth not suit; because a Husband cannot be offered to a Woman in several respects, as Christ may be unto a Sinner. I do not conceive Faith to justifie *modo Physico*, or merely because it is of that nature to apprehend Christ and his Righteousness: If it were not for the Promise of the Gospel, this Act of Faith would not avail. As suppose the Devils should apprehend the Righteousness of Christ, yet should they not be justified, because the Promise of the Gospel doth not belong unto them. Yet this apprehending of Christ and his Righteousness being the Physical

Act

Act of Faith, and withal made the Condition of Justification, in that the Gospel doth promise Justification unto those that apprehend Christ and his Righteousness; I see not but I may well say, That Faith doth justifie us, apprehending Christ and his Righteousness, this being it which the Gospel doth require unto Justification. Faith as apprehending Christ being the Condition of Justification, it is all one to say, Faith doth justifie as apprehending Christ, and Faith doth justifie as the Condition required unto Justification. Whereas therefore you prove, That Faith or Acceptance of Christ simply considered in it self doth not justifie; it is nothing to me, who do not ascribe any thing to Faith in order to Justification as it is considered simply in it self, but as it being of such a nature is in that respect required of us, to that end that we may be justified. And thus (I think) do others mean, when they say, That Faith doth justifie as apprehending Christ, and his Righteousness: they do not (I suppose) exclude, but include the requiring of Faith in this respect as a Condition of Justification.

Pemble having said, [*We are justified by Faith*, i. e. *by the Righteousness of Christ, the benefit whereof unto our justification we are made partakers of by Faith, as the only Grace which accepts of the Promise, and gives us assurance of the Performance*]. He adds a little after, [*He that looked on Christ believing in him, may truly be said to be saved and justified by Faith, not for the worth, and by the efficacy of that Act of his, but as it is the Condition of the Promise of Grace, that must necessarily go before the Performance of it unto us; upon our obedience whereunto, God is pleased of his free Grace to justifie us*]. Of Justif. §. 2. c. 1. p. 27.

But still notwithstanding all you say, my Argument remains good; [*Works concur not with Faith in apprehending Christ, therefore they concur not with it in justifying*]. The Consequence is good, because Faith as apprehending Christ is made the Condition of Justification. For this is that which Believing in, or on Christ, doth import, which is put as equivalent to the receiving of Christ, *Joh.* 1. 12. That Repentance and Obedience do concur with Faith in being Conditions of Continued and Consummate Justification, you only affirm, but do not prove. Indeed Repentance as taken for an ac-

acknowledgment of, and ſorrow for ſin, is requiſite unto Juſtification at firſt. For how ſhould we ever look unto Chriſt as ſuffering for our ſins, except we be ſenſible of them, and humbled for them. Yet it is Faith apprehending Chriſt, which in the Covenant is made the Condition of our Juſtification, as that whereby we are made partakers of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, by which we are juſtified. It is neither Repentance, nor Obedience, though Repentance (in the ſence before-mentioned) muſt go before this Juſtifying-Faith, and ſo before Juſtification; and obedience muſt follow after.

Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. l. 5. c. 4. §. 5.

Penitentia (ſaith *Ames.*) *quatenus eſt legalis humiliatio antecedit quidem juſtificationem, ut diſpoſitio ex ordine prærequiſita, ſed non ut cauſa. Reſipiſcentia Evangelica vel notat converſionem totam, cujus primaria pars eſt fides, ut* Act. 11. *&* Ezech. 18. *vel eſt ipſa fides juſtificantis, atque adeo ipſius juſtificationis effectum, qualis fuit pœnitentia illa ad ſalutem,* 2 Cor. 7. 10. *Quocunque modo accipiatur, dolor ac deteſtatio peccati non poteſt eſſe cauſa juſtificans, quia* (*N. B.*) *non habet vim applicandi nobis juſtitiam Chriſti. Acquiſitio talis boni non conſiſtit in averſatione mali. Reſipiſcentia & fides differentia hac indigitatur,* Act. 20. 21. *Reſipiſcentia in Deum, & fides in Dominum Noſtrum Ieſum Chriſtum.* See alſo Mr. *Ball* of the *Coven.* c. 3. p. 18, 19.

69, &c. 1. You need not trouble your ſelf to prove, That by VVorks are meant VVorks. For ſurely a working Faith, or a Faith bringing forth the Fruit of VVorks, doth imply VVorks. But the Queſtion is, VVhether VVorks concur with Faith in juſtifying, or only are inſeparable Attendants, and neceſſary Fruits of that Faith which juſtifieth. You hold the former, yet only in reſpect of continued and conſummate Juſtification: I hold the latter in reſpect of Juſtification begun, continued, and conſummate. VVhether of us hath more ground from Scripture, let it be judged by what hath been ſaid about it.

But 1. whereas you ſay, That VVorks are ſtill oppoſed to Faith without VVorks, or Faith alone, and not to this or that ſort of Faith: I have ſhewed before from *Oecumenius* (not to ſpeak of our late VVriters) that there is one ſort of Faith that is with VVorks, or of a working Diſpoſition, and ſuch is Faith truly apprehending Chriſt:

and

and another sort of Faith, that is without VVorks, *viz.* a bare Assent: and that St. *James* doth oppose these two sorts of Faith one to the other, teaching that we are justified by the former, not by the latter.

2. You say, [*It is not only Faith alone without a working disposition, but Faith alone without Works themselves when there is opportunity*]; yet your self deny not only the efficacy, but even the presence of VVorks to be requisite, when we are at first justified: and St. *James* denies Faith alone (so as he doth speak of it) to have any force at all to justifie, as being dead and unprofitable. Therefore you must needs grant, That it is Faith alone, without a working Disposition of which St. *James* speaketh. Besides, if there be a working Disposition, there will be VVorks themselves when there is opportunity. But all this doth only prove, That Justifying Faith is of a working Disposition, and produceth VVorks themselves when opportunity is offered: That VVorks do at any time concur with Faith unto Justification, it no way proveth.

3. Surely a disposition to feed the hungry, is accepted of God, when there is no opportunity to do the thing it self. And so a Disposition to work may be enough to prove Faith to be of a right stamp, though VVorks themselves be requisite when there is opportunity: and still I must put you in mind, that your self requires no more than a disposition to work, when we are first justified.

4. What you can infer from *Jam.* 2. 13. I do not see. He that expects mercy from God, must shew mercy to his Neighbour. Doth it therefore follow, that VVorks of Mercy justifie as well as Faith? No, but that Justifying Faith must and will shew it self by VVorks of Mercy.

5. A real Faith being but a bare Assent, as in the Devils, cannot justifie or save. Who opposeth this? Or whom doth it oppose? So, that the same Faith is justifying and saving, I think all will yeeld: yet is there more required unto Salvation, as taken for the accomplishment of it, than unto Justification.

6. VVho makes *James* v. 18. to speak such non-sence as you tell of? Do they, who say his meaning is, That Faith is pretended in vain, if it do not shew it self by VVorks, as occasion doth require? And what more can any gather from v. 20, 22, 24, 26? You might save your labour

labour of proving, That by VVorks are meant VVorks: you should prove that Works are spoken of as concurring with Faith, and as having a co-interest with it in the effect of justifying, and not only as Fruits of that Faith by which we are justified. This is that which they mean, who say that *James* doth speak of a working Faith, *i. e.* a Faith ready to work, and so actually working, when God doth require it, not as if instead of [Works] it were good sense always to put [a working Faith]. Such sophistry doth not become us.

7. That *James* doth assert the necessity of Works, as fruits of Justifying Faith, is ever granted: that he doth assert the necessity of them as concurrent with Faith unto Justification, is never proved. Works are therefore necessary to prove Faith to be such as God requires unto Justification.

Against this first you say, *James* doth make VVorks or Working necessary to justifie; I say, he doth not, but only drives at this, That none must think to be justified by Faith, except it be a working Faith, as *Abraham*'s and *Rahab*'s was. You say, [*The Soul doth not truly signifie the Body to be alive*]. But the word *Jam.* 2. 26. is πνεῦμα, Breath, which is but an effect of Life, and not a cause of it.

Of Grace and Faith, *pag.* 240. [*Thus* (faith *Pemble*) *the comparison is exact; As the Body without Breath is dead, so is Faith without Works*].

Appendix to the Doctrine of the Certainty of Salvation. So *Downam*; [*Neither doth St.* James *compare Works to the Soul, but to the Breath, as the word* πνεῦμα (*derived of* πνεω *to Breath*) *doth properly signifie*, &c. *So that the meaning of St.* James *is, As the Body without Breath is dead, even so Faith without Works* (*which are as it were the breathing of a lively Faith*) *is dead*].

But if by πνεῦμα there be meant the Soul, as 1 *Cor.* 6. *ult.* I hope you will not so understand it, as to compare Faith to the Body, and Works to the Soul, as if Works were the Soul of Faith, and so did give Life unto it: whereas indeed Faith doth produce Works, and Works do but evidence Faith, and the lively power of it.

On *Jam.* 2. *ult.* [*The Apostle*, (faith *Fulk*) *in this Similitude doth not make Faith the Body, and Works the Soul; but Works the Argument of the Life and Soul of Faith, which is trust in God*, &c.]

2. God

2. God (you say) needs no Signs. Well, but God (say I) requiring such a Faith, whereof Works are Signs, as Fruits and Effects of it, we must look to the signs of our Faith, to find it such as God requires of us to our Justification. *Maccovius* (it seems) met with the Objection; *At Deo non est opus experimento.* Resp. *Hoc sane verum est: at non proinde sequitur hominis non prabere sui experimentum Deo.* *De Justif. Disp. 10. sub. plura in hanc rem vide-re licet.*

3. Faith may be real, and yet not justifying. A real Assent, yea and Consent, if limited, so as to exclude Christ's dominion over us, is not that Faith which your Opposers plead for.

4. The New Testament doth make a working Faith, yet not Faith as working the Condition of Justification. I wonder how you can stumble at this, when as you constantly hold, That we are justified at first by Faith without Works: yet surely that Faith whereby we are justified at first, is a working Faith, *i. e.* of a working Nature, and will, when there is opportunity, shew it self by Works. That working therefore is together with Faith the Condition of Justification, is more than your own Principles will admit, without that distinction of Justification Inchoated, and Justification Continued, of which though you make much use, yet I see little ground for it. Now for Dr. *Preston*'s words, which I cited, I think they are clear enough against you.

For first he saith, That Faith alone justifieth and maketh Works only Concomitants or Fruits of that Faith by which we are justified. You limit it to Justification as begun, but he speaks of Justification simply considered, and not as begun only.

2. He speaks indeed of a double Justification, but not as you do, nor to that intent to bring in a double Righteousness as requisite unto Justification. All that he intends is this, That we are justified only by Faith, according to *Paul*'s Doctrine; yet (as *James* teacheth) our Faith must appear to be a true Justifying Faith by Works, otherwise it is but a false and feigned Faith, as it pretendeth to be Justifying, and he that pretendeth it, is a Hypocrite. His words without doing violence unto them, can have no other sense put upon them. When any one is accused of being but a seeming Believer, or a mere Believer without Obedience, take Believing merely as it

is the Condition of Justification by the Covenant, it is but (as I have often said) the making good this Accusation, That he is a Transgressor of the Law, and to be condemned by the Law for the transgression of it, and so much the more in that he neglected the benefit offered in the New Covenant. So that in this case to justifie a Man by his Faith and VVorks, is but indeed to plead that he is justified by the Righteousness of Christ imputed unto him through Faith, which Faith is proved to be sound and good by his VVorks.

1. I see you are very tenacious of your Opinion: but if you will not forsake your Opinion till you see better Arguments to draw you from it, marvel not if others will not embrace your Opinion till they see better Arguments to draw them to it. But to the Matter; Me-thinks you might easily see the meaning of this, that *Abraham*'s first Justification could not be by Faith, which was without VVorks, *i. e.* by Faith, which was not of a working Nature.

Thus in that very page (52.) I explained my self, saying, [Faith if it be alone without VVorks, *i. e. renuens operari, &c.* cannot justifie].

2. Do not you see that your Answer is to no purpose in limiting the words of the Apostle to Continued and Consummate Justification, whereas he doth utterly exclude Faith, which is without VVorks, or which is not of a working Disposition, from being able to justifie, as being a Faith that is dead and unprofitable?

In Jac. 2. 23. That which you so slight, as if it were *indignus vindice nodus*, Calvin (a Man as likely to see into the Apostle's meaning as another) calls *nodum insolubilem*, as I have before noted. That more Conditions are required unto Justification afterward than at first, is more than I can find, and more (I am perswaded) than will ever be proved. Did *Paul* when he speaketh so much of Justification by Faith without VVorks, *viz.* as concurring with Faith unto Justification, mean that we are so justified indeed to day, but not so to morrow, or some time after? All his Arguments shew the contrary. Yea, doth he not prove from *Gen.* 15. 6. that *Abraham* was justified only by Believing, when as yet that was not the beginning of his Justification? So when *James* saith, That we are not justified by Faith, which is without VVorks, such a Faith being

being dead, and no better than the Faith of Devils; was his meaning this, That hereafter indeed we cannot be so justified, but yet at present we may? If you be of this mind, *Non equidem invideo, miror magis.*

3. Of the sense of *James* his Discourse enough before. And for v. 17. I think it might easily let you see that he speaketh not (as you suppose) only of Continued and Consummate Justification, but of Inchoated also, and consequently that he cannot be interpreted otherwise than thus, That Faith which doth not shew it self by VVorks, is dead, ineffectual, and of no force to justifie, either at first or afterward, as not being that Faith which is required unto Justification, *viz.* a working Faith, or Faith which is of a working Nature. I have noted before what *Oecumenius* (one that was long before either *Calvin* or *Luther*) saith upon that very Verse, as also how in the judgment of the Syriack Interpreter, and other Learned Men κατ' ἐαυτὸν there is to be understood.

1. Though Faith may be true and real without Works, yet a living Faith it is not; for a living Faith is operative, so that, a working Faith, and a non-working Faith are of different Natures, this being but a bare and naked Assent, but the other an apprehending of Christ, and a receiving of him. I little doubt but the Faith of Devils, and the Faith of Men who are justified (even at first, when you say VVorks are not requisite in respect of their presence with Faith, though that Faith (say I) is of a working Disposition), differ much in their very Nature. *Ibid.*

2. If you will be true to your own Principles, you cannot say, That VVorks make Faith alive, or that Faith is not alive without VVorks as actually present, though you consider Faith meerly as a Condition of Justification, seeing you hold Faith to be alive in that respect, when we are first justified, though there be no VVorks present with it. And though, as there must be a promptitude to VVorks at first, so there must be VVorks themselves in due season; yet that VVorks do afterward concur with Faith unto Justification, is more than yet I see, or (I presume) ever shall see proved.

3. Therefore my Argument stands good against you, until you can make it appear, That Faith alone without the Copartnership of VVorks, is the Condition of Justi-

fication at first, but Faith and VVorks together of Justification afterward. I have shewed some Reasons against it, but I can see none for it. Your Similitude of a Fine, &c. is no proof. Similitudes may illustrate something, but they prove nothing.

Ibid. 1. You said, [*The Apostle saith, That Faith did Work in and with his Works*]; whereas the Apostle using the word συνεργεῖ did not speak of working in, but only of working with.

2. Of what validity that distinction is (of Justification Inchoated, and Justification Continued and Consummate) you have not yet shewed.

3. VVhat *Calvin*'s Opinion otherwise was, is not to the purpose. I only alledged his Exposition of those words, *Fides cooperata est operibus suis*; and I think his Exposition is genuine.

On *Jam.* 2. 22. So also Mr. *Manton*; [*That sense which I prefer,* (saith he) *is, That his Faith rested not in a naked bare Profession, but was operative, it had its efficacy and influence upon his Works, co-working with all other Graces: it doth not only exert, and put forth it self in acts of Believing, but also in working*].

Beza renders it, *Administra fuit operum ejus*, and expounds it, *Efficax & fœcunda bonorum operum.*

Ibid. & 73. 1. I shewed before how not only *Piscator* and *Pemble*, but many others both before and after them, interpret those words, [*By Works his Faith was made perfect*]; *i. e.* By VVorks his Faith did appear perfect, *i. e.* found and good. This Exposition is such that as yet I see no reason to dislike it.

2. I grant that Faith without VVorks (*viz.* when God doth require them) is dead as to the effect of Justifying; Yea, and it is also dead in it self, being but a dead Assent, having no life, no operative vertue in it.

3. *Abraham*'s Faith was, is, and shall be manifested to be perfect, *i. e.* sincere by his VVorks, to all that were, are, and shall be able to discern the true nature of Justifying Faith. Although there were none then that could discern this, (which yet is not to be supposed, *Isaac* was then of age to discern it, and so others of *Abraham*'s Family to whom the thing was known) yet to after-Ages the perfection of *Abraham*'s Faith is made manifest by his VVorks, especially his offering his Son upon the Altar.

And

And if God did say, [*Now I know that thou fearest me*, &c.] why may it not be said, speaking of God, *διδεγνωσθαι*, that thereby *Abraham*'s Faith and its Perfection appeared to God himself? Certain it is, that the VVork spoken of did proceed from Faith, *Heb.* 11. 7. And therefore as the Effect doth shew the Cause to be perfect, so did *Abraham*'s VVorks (especially that of offering up *Isaac*) shew his Faith to be perfect. To the Second:

1. Though Justifying Faith include in it three Acts, mentioned *Heb.* 11. 13. yet there are but two of them properly and peculiarly Acts of Faith. For Seeing, or Knowing, the first there mentioned, is but presupposed unto Faith.

Bellarmine in this saith truly, (though it was little to his purpose); *Cognitio apprehensiva praexigitur quidem ad fidem, sed non est ipsa propriè fides.* *De Justif. lib.* 1. *c.* 16.

The other two Acts, *viz.* Perswasion and Embracing, though distinct, yet are both comprehended in Believing.

2. I see no cloudiness in this, [*Believing justifieth, not as it is our Act, but in respect of its Object*]; neither is this to speak darkness, except to a dark Understanding, which (I know) yours is not. But you know what is said of some, *Faciunt nimium intelligendo, ut nihil intelligant.* VVhat is more vulgar with Divines (and those no vulgar ones neither) than to say, That Faith doth not justifie as it is a VVork of ours, but in respect of its Object, Christ, whom it apprehendeth, and by whom so apprehended, we are justified?

Hujus satisfactionis apprehendendæ medium (saith one whom *Rivet* much commends) *fides est. Deo sic ordinante, ut non aliis illius participes sint, quàm qui eam sincerâ fide amplectuntur, non ita tamen ut ipsa fides ratione sui nos Deo gratos faciat & acceptos, sed ratione objecti, quod apprehendit, & cujus meritum nobis applicat, & perfectam obedientiam.* Vigner. *de Satisfact. Christi. Rivet. Disp.* 13.

So *Rivet* himself saith; *Fides non justificat, quatenus est opus justitiæ, sed quatenus apprehendit justitiam Christi.* *De Fide Justif. Disp.* 10.

Divers others to this purpose have been cited before. Your Question [*Why doth not the Object justifie without the Act?*] is soon answered; Because the Act (Believing)

lieving) is required on our part, *Deo sic ordinante*, (as the Author before-cited ſaith) That ſo the Object (Chriſt's Righteouſneſs) may become ours unto Juſtification: yet ſtill it is in reſpect of the Object (Chriſt's Righteouſneſs) that the Act (Believing) doth juſtifie. You darken my words, when you transform them thus, [*It juſtifieth in reſpect to its Object*]; I ſay, [in reſpect of its Object], and ſo you firſt cited it. My meaning is this, It is the Object of Faith, *viz.* Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, though as apprehended by Faith, whereby we are juſtified.

Medul. l. 1. c. 27. §. 14. *Eſt autem hac juſtificatio propter Chriſtum* (ſaith *Ameſius*) *non abſolute conſideratum, quo ſenſu Chriſtus etiam eſt cauſa ipſius vocationis, ſed propter Chriſtum fide apprehenſum.*

This is clear by that *Acts* 13. 39. [*By him all that believe are juſtified*].

Of the Coven. *c. 6. p. 65.* I will add Mr. *Ball*'s words, which in ſenſe are the ſame with mine, and there is little difference (as to clearneſs or cloudineſs) in the Expreſſion; [*The Third Expoſition is, That when Faith is imputed for Righteouſneſs, it is not underſtood materially, as though the Dignity, Worth, and Perfection of Faith made us juſt; but relatively and in reſpect of its Object: that is, to us believing, Righteouſneſs,* ſc. *of Chriſt, is freely imputed, and by Faith we freely receive Righteouſneſs, and remiſſion of ſins freely given of God. And therefore to ſay, Faith juſtifieth, and Faith is imputed for Righteouſneſs, are phraſes equivalent. For Faith juſtifieth not by its merit or dignity, but as an Inſtrument, and correlatively, that is, the merit of Chriſt apprehended and received by Faith, juſtifieth, not Faith, whereby it is apprehended and received, unleſs it be by an improper ſpeech, whereby the Act of the Object, by reaſon of the near and ſtrict connexion betwixt them, is given to the Inſtrument*].

3. What you have ſaid before about Works perfecting Faith, hath been conſidered. Though Faith may ſave without manifeſtation, yet not except it be of that nature, as to manifeſt it ſelf by Works, when God doth call for them.

You ſay, [*Works do perfect Faith, ut Medium & Conditio*]; you mean of Juſtification: but that Works are *Medium & Conditio Juſtificationis*, you do not prove.

The

The Tree and its Fruit are considered as distinct; *ut Causa & Effectum, non ut Totum & Pars*; and so the perfection of the Tree is only manifested by its Fruit. It is not therefore a good Tree, because it beareth good Fruit; but it therefore beareth good Fruit, because it is a good Tree.

For the Third: If Procreation (as you grant) do not perfect Marriage in its Essence, then it adds only an accidental perfection unto it.

4. Your Explication is indeed now more full, so that I can better see your meaning, yet still I am unsatisfied. For I do not conceive that Faith properly is our Covenant, but that whereby we embrace God's Covenant. Though a Covenant differ from a Promise, yet it doth include a Promise. Now a Promise is *de futuro*; so that our reciprocal Promise, both of Faith and Obedience, I take to be our Covenant. Faith is in part the matter of the Covenant, but not properly the Covenant it self, and perhaps when you call it our Covenant, you only mean, that it is the matter of our Covenant.

I being there the Respondent, it was sufficient for me to deny, the proof did lie upon you. Yet nevertheless the Assertion (*viz.* Faith alone is the Condition of the Covenant, for so much as concerns Justification) is sufficiently proved by those places, where we are said to be justified by Faith, and that without Works, *viz.* as concurring with Faith unto Justification. And for the reason of the Assertion, (*viz.* because Faith alone doth apprehend Christ's Righteousness) much hath been said of it before. What do our Divines more inculcate than this? 73.

Wotton saith, that only Faith doth justifie; *Quia sola fide recta in Christum tendimus, & promissiones Dei de justificatione amplectimur. De Reconcil. Part* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 18.

Amesius saith; *Dolor ac detestatio peccati non potest esse causa justificans, quia non habet vim applicandi nobis justitiam Christi. Contra* Bellar. *tom.* 4. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 4. *Sect.* 5.

So *Bucanus*; *Fides* (inquit) *sola justificat, quia ipsa est unicum instrumentum, & unica facultas in nobis, qua recipimus justitiam Christi. L. c.* 31. *ad Q. est.* 37.

Of the Coven. chap. 3. p. 18, 19.

Thus also Mr. *Ball*; [*By Repentance we know our selves, we feel our selves, we hunger and thirst after Grace; but the hand which we stretch forth to receive it, is Faith alone*, &c.] And a little after; [*When therefore Justification and Life is said to be by Faith, it is manifestly signified, That Faith receiving the Promise, doth receive Righteousness and Life freely promised*].

You your self do sometimes say, That Faith hath in it an aptitude to justifie in this respect; only you deny, that this aptitude of Faith is sufficient, and say that therefore it doth justifie, because God in his Covenant hath made it the Condition of Justification. Now I also grant, That if Faith were not ordained to that end of God, its bare aptitude, or its being that whereby we apprehend Christ, would not justifie. Yet (I say) it appears by Scripture, That because Faith alone hath this aptitude to justifie, *viz.* by apprehending Christ, therefore God hath made it alone the Condition of Justification. This appears in that we are said to be justified by Believing in, or on Christ, which imports an apprehending and receiving of him, *Joh.* 1. 12.

2. Repentance doth avail with Faith, yet are we justified only by Faith, and not by Repentance, and that for the reason even now alledged, *viz.* because not Repentance, but Faith is the Hand by which Christ is received.

3. Though Remission of Sins be ordinarily ascribed to Repentance, yet it is no where said, That Repentance is imputed unto us for Righteousness, as it is said of Faith. Repentance in some sense is precedaneous to Justification, Justifying Faith doth presuppose Repentance; yet Faith and not Repentance is made the Condition and Instrument of Justification, as being that which doth apprehend the Righteousness of Christ, by which we are justified.

4. That though Faith only be the Condition of Justification at first, yet Obedience also is a Condition afterward, is often said, but never proved. I take Justification both at first and afterward to be by the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us; therefore not by Obedience, but by Faith, by which alone we apprehend the Righteousness of Christ, that so it may be ours unto Justification. Certainly that was not the beginning of *Abraham's*

ham's Justification, which is mentioned *Gen.* 15. 6. Yet by that doth the Apostle prove that *Abraham* was, and all must be, justified, not by Obedience, but by Faith only.

1. Faith apt to produce good Works, is necessary to procure that first change, which makes us (in God's account) *Justos ex Injustis*. For if it be not such a Faith, it is dead, and of no force. *Ib.* & 74.

2. I hope you will not deny, but that being justified by Believing, every after Act of Faith doth find us justified; for you are against the Amission and Intercision of Justification. Yet I confess; That the continuance of Faith is necessary to the continuance of Justification. So it must needs be, seeing we are justified by Faith; therefore every Act of Faith may be said to justifie, as well as the first Act, because by after-Acts of Faith we continue justified.

Nihil erit absurdi, (*inquit* Rivetus) *si dicamus, in quolibet vera fides actu imputari justitiam credenti. Etsi enim justificatio sit actus momentaneus, cujus nunquam planè amittitur effectus in piis, qui semel justificati sunt, indigent nihilominùs renovatione sensus justificationis suæ, qui sensus fit per fidem, & tunc dicitur etiam fides imputari ad justitiam. Nam apprehensio illa fides habet fluxum suum continuum secundùm plus & minus; præsertim cum fidelis, & si justificatus, subinde in peccata incidat, propter quæ opus etiam habet remissione peccatorum. Quod continuum beneficium fide apprehensum, si secundam justificationem appellare velint adversarii, imò tertiam, quartam, quintam, & millesimam, non repugnabimus, dummodo constet, nullâ aliâ ratione nos justificari à peccatis sequentibus, quàm eâ, quâ semel justificati fuimus à præcedentibus.* In Gen. 15. Exer. 83.

Works therefore do not concur with Faith unto Justification no more afterward than at first.

3. Your reasons whereby you endeavour to confute this Assertion, [*As our Justification is begun, so it is continued*, viz. *by Faith only, and not by Works as concurrent with Faith unto Justification afterward, though not at first*] seem to be of no force.

I answer therefore, *Ad* 1. How do I contradict it by saying, [As it is begun, so it is continued by Faith?] What though there be divers Acts of Faith, yet still it is

Faith, and Faith without the concurrence of Works, by which we are justified as well afterward as at first, which is all that I assert? Because a continued Act of Faith is requisite to the Continuation of Justification, doth it therefore follow that Works have a co-interest with Faith in the effect of Justifying?

* *How Repentance is requisite unto Justification, and yet doth not justifie, was shewed before.*

Ad 2. Do you think * Repentance only requisite to the Continuation of Justification, and not also to the Inchoation of it?

Ad 3. We are not to measure God's Covenant by Humane Covenants. God's Covenant doth reach further than to Justification; and more may be requisite for the enjoyment of those benefits which belong unto Justified Persons, than is requisite unto Justification.

74. Your Similitudes are no Proofs; and you still suppose that there is one Condition of Justification at first, and another Condition thereof afterwards; that though at first we are justified only by Faith, yet afterward by Faith and Works. But though Works are required of Justified Persons, as Fruits of that Faith whereby they are justified; yet they do not therefore concur with Faith unto Justification, which as it is begun by Faith only, so is it also continued. Your self observe, That *Abraham*'s Believing, mentioned *Gen.* 15. was not his first Act of Faith. So then he was justified before by Faith, and so was he also afterward, even by Faith only, as the Apostle from that very place doth prove *Rom.* 4. Therefore by Faith without Works (*viz.* as having a co-partnership with Faith in Justifying), *Abraham* was justified both at first and afterward.

Ibid. 1. Do you think that *Abraham* was justified from the guilt of those many sins, which he committed after his first Justification by his Works? *Credat Judæus*: for my part I cannot but detest such Doctrine. I know no way whereby he could be justified from those sins, but by Faith in Christ, even as he was at first justified. Besides (as I noted before, and that as acknowledged by your self), *Abraham* was justified before he produced that Act of Faith spoken of *Gen.* 15. and in the *interim* no doubt he committed some sins, yet still by Faith, and not by Works (as *Paul* sheweth) * he was justified.

* *Vide* Calvin. *Instit. l.* 3. *c.* 14. §. 11.

2. You do but still affirm, without any proof at all, That *Abraham*'s Justification could not be continued by the

the same means (*viz.* by Faith alone) works not concurring with it unto Justification) as it was begun.

3. For Sentential Justification at the Last Judgment, I have said enough before.

Bucan having said, that *Abraham* was Justified *operibus, tanquam testimoniis Justificationis*; Adds, *Quomodo etiam Deus dicitur in extremo illo die justificaturus electos suos ex ipsorum operibus.* *Loc.* 31. *ad quæst.* 39.

And again; *Fides principium existentiæ, facit ut simus justi; Opera autem ut principium cognitionis faciunt, ut cognoscamur justi. Ideò Deus in extremo die proponet principium cognitionis justitiæ fidei, quod incurret in oculos omnium creaturarum.*

4. I think the Argument is good and sound, [Christ's Righteousness, whereby we are justified, is an everlasting Righteousness; therefore our Justification is an everlasting Justification]. This alwayes presupposed, That this Righteousness of Christ be apprehended by Faith; for otherwise there is no being justified at all by it.

1. To be just *quoad præstationem Conditionis*, is but to be just in some respect; and in some respect just even the most unjust may be. Yet it is true, This *præstatio Conditionis* will be of force to procure Universal Justification: not that it is it self the Righteousness by which we are justified, but only the Means whereby we are made Partakers of the Righteousness of Christ, and so by his Righteousness are universally justified. And though this performing of the Condition be required unto Justification, yet nevertheless that remains good which I said in the *Animadversions*, [*If we be fully freed from the accusation of the Law, we are fully justified*]. For can we be fully freed from the Accusation of the Law, except we perform the Condition required in the Gospel? And if we be fully freed from the Accusation of the Law, will the Gospel accuse us? *It is the Law that worketh Wrath*, Rom. 4. 15. The Gospel doth free from Wrath, though not without performing the Condition; for then it suffereth the Law to have its force, and to inflict Wrath; and that so much the more, in that so great a benefit was neglected. *Ibid.* & 75.

2. The performing of a Condition, as the Condition is a Duty, is a Righteousness, but such as cannot justifie,

as

as we now ſpeak of Juſtification. But as the Condition is meerly a Condition, the performing of it is not properly Righteouſneſs, though by it we partake of Righteouſneſs, *viz.* the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, by which we are juſtified.

3. Therefore this is no contradiction, to grant Faith to be the Condition of Juſtification, and yet to deny it to be the Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified.

De Satisfact. Chriſti, inter Opera Riveti Diſp. 13. §. 61.

That which you think to be moſt clear, *Vignerius* (before cited) thought moſt abſurd. *An poſſibile eſt (inquit) ut ſit Fides Inſtrumentum accipiendæ juſtitiæ, (ſeu Conditio ad obtinendam juſtitiam requiſita, ſi ita loqui libeat) & ſimul ſit ipſa, quam quærimus, juſtitia?*

Indeed you ſeem but to ſtrive about words; for here immediately you confeſs, That it is but a Subordinate Righteouſneſs, meaning (I think) that which all acknowledg, that it is but a means whereby to partake of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs. And you that charge others with Self-Contradiction, ſeem not to agree with your ſelf. For here preſently after you ſay, [*This Perſonal Righteouſneſs præſtitæ conditionis N. T. muſt be had, before we can have that which freeth us from the Law*]; yet elſewhere your Expreſſions are ſuch, as if being firſt juſtified from the Accuſation of the Law, by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, we ſhould after be juſtified from the Accuſation of the Goſpel by Perſonal Righteouſneſs. However (as I have ſaid before) this latter Accuſation is but a further proſecution and confirmation of the former, by taking away the Plea that ſome might make why the Accuſation of the Law ſhould not ſtand good, and be of force to condemn them.

4. Of what force is Satans Accuſation againſt any, if he cannot make good his Accuſation, ſo as to procure his Condemnation? And are not Unbelievers and Rebels againſt Chriſt condemned by the Law? Is it not for ſin that they are condemned? And is there any ſin which is not againſt the Law? The Goſpel indeed may aggravate Sin, and increaſe Condemnation: and ſo thoſe words which you cite [*The words which I ſpeak ſhall judg you*, &c.] may be underſtood; as thoſe are more clearly to the purpoſe *Joh.* 15. 22. *If I had not come and ſpoken unto them, they had not had ſin*, (*viz.* in ſo high degree

degree as it follows) *but now they have no cloak for their sin.* But ſtill it is by the Law that all ſinners are convinced and condemned. As for Righteouſneſs, whereby one is juſtified from a falſe Accuſation, it is but ſuch as the Devil himſelf may have, as hath been noted before, though Faith be of force to take off all Satan's Accuſations whatſoever. And when Satan doth accuſe any of not performing the Condition of the Goſpel, he doth but only ſhew that ſuch ſtand guilty by the Law, and ſo are to be condemned, as having no benefit of the Goſpel, becauſe they have not performed the Condition of it: So that ſtill it is the Law, by which Satan doth accuſe and bring to condemnation.

But by the way I obſerve, That in this place of your *Aphor.* (*p.* 308.) you ſay, That *Rom.* 3. 28. and 4. 2, 3, 14, 15, 16. *Paul* concludeth, that neither Faith, nor Works, is the Righteouſneſs which we muſt plead againſt the Accuſation of the Law, but the Righteouſneſs which is by Faith, *i. e.* Chriſt's Righteouſneſs: Yet before in this Writing you ſtand upon the very Letter of the Text, and will have it to prove, That Faith it ſelf properly taken is our Righteouſneſs. If you ſay that you mean our Evangelical Righteouſneſs, yet ſo you agree not with your ſelf in your *Aphoriſms*, where you make *Paul* in thoſe Texts to ſpeak of our Legal Righteouſneſs.

1. They againſt whom *James* diſputed, relied on Faith as the Condition of the New Covenant; but it was not ſuch a Faith as the New Covenant doth require, it was a Faith *renuens operari*; upon that account *James* confuted them, not as if Faith alone without Works (though yet a Faith ready to ſhew it ſelf by Works) were not the Condition of Juſtification. 75.

2. I am ſorry that *Beza*'s words, which I cited, and which to me ſeem very excellent, ſhould be ſo cenſured by you, as if there were I know not how many miſtakes in them; but truly I think the miſtakes will be found to be in your cenſure.

To your Exceptions I anſwer; 1. *Quis vel ex noſtris, vel ex Tranſmarinis Theologis, Fidem pro Cauſa* (*nempe Inſtrumentali*) *Juſtificationis non habet?*

2. Beza *ait, tu negas; Utri potius aſſentiendum? Quid dico Beza? Quis enim iſtud non dicit? Sed hominum authoritate nolo te obruere, rationes antè allatæ expendantur.* 3. *Affir-*

3. *Affirmas tantùm, non probas, Opera à* Jacobo *ſtabiliri ut Juſtificationis Conditiones & Media. Effecti ut effecti poteſt eſſe neceſſitas ad veritatem cauſæ comprobandam, nec aliâ ratione operum neceſſitas à* Jacobo *ſtabilitur; neque enim ad juſtificationem procurandam, ſed ad eam duntaxat comprobandam, tanquam Juſtificantis Fidei fructus, Opera ut neceſſaria ſtabiliuntur, ut anteâ ex ipſâ Apoſtoli Argumentatione oſtenſum eſt.*

4. *Nec* Beza, *nec alius quiſquam (quòd ſciam) diſtinctionem iſtam de Juſtificatione Inchoatâ, & Juſtificatione Continuatâ, quaſi ſc. alia hujus, alia illius eſſet conditio, perſpectam habuit. Hujus inventionis gloriam ego equidem tibi non invideo.*

Ibid. 1. Certain it is, All Works are not the fulfilling of the Old Law's Condition; but all Works whereby we are juſtified, are the fulfilling of it; and therefore (as I ſaid in the *Animadverſions*) to be juſtified by Works, and to be juſtified by the Law, are with *Paul* one and the ſame; See *River, Diſp de Fide Juſtif.* §. 21. the words are before cited.

2. We are juſtified by the New Law, againſt the Accuſation of the Old Law. Certainly if we be accuſed of Unbelief and Rebellion againſt Chriſt, we are accuſed of being Sinners. For are Unbelief and Rebellion againſt Chriſt no ſins?

3. Who doth not ſo diſtinguiſh of τὸ *Credere*, except ſome few whom I have no mind to follow? But how will this Diſtinction, *inter quod opus, & quâ opus*, ſerve to keep in Obedience, as having a joint intereſt with Faith in Juſtification? What dark Equivocal (I pray) is this, That Faith doth juſtifie as that whereby we are made Partakers of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs? Your ſelf acknowledges an aptitude in Faith to juſtifie in this reſpect; and in this reſpect (I ſay) Faith is appointed to be the Condition of Juſtification.

Ibid. I take what you grant, *viz.* That *Paul* doth not imply Obedience as concurrent with Faith in our firſt Juſtification: that he doth imply it as concurrent in our Juſtification afterward, you ſhould prove, and not content your ſelf with the bare affirming of it. Doth not *Paul* by that *Gen.* 15. [*Abraham believed God*, &c.] prove that *Abraham* was juſtified by Faith without the concurrence of Obedience? Yes: that was not the firſt time

that

that *Abraham* either believed, or was justified. The truth therefore is, *Paul* implieth Obedience as the Fruit of that Faith which justifieth both at first and last, but not as concurring with Faith unto Justification either at first or last.

1. There is a necessity of Faith shewing it self by Works, that so it may appear to be such a Faith whereby Christ is truly apprehended and received. But are Works therefore Copartners with Faith in justifying, because only such a Faith doth justifie as doth also produce Works? You exclude Works from having any thing to do in our Justification at first, yet surely Works must follow as Fruits of that Faith whereby we are at first justified. *Ibid.* & 76.

2. For the Texts alledged, that *Mat.* 12. 37. [*By thy words thou shalt be justified*, &c.] is as plain you say as [*We are justified by Faith*]. But if it be so plain, it may seem wonderful, that *Bellarmine* should never make use of it, when he labours to prove, That Faith alone doth not justifie; which (so far as I observe) he doth not. Nor do the Rhemists on the place take any notice of those words, who yet are ready to catch at every thing that may but seem to make for them. Yet it seems some of our Romish Adversaries have laid hold on those words.

But hear how *Calvin* doth censure them for it; *Quod autem Papistæ ad enervandam fidei justitiam hoc sorquent, puerile est.* Ad Mat. 12. 37.

Certainly all good that we do, may justifie *quadantenus*, so far as it is good: But can we therefore be simply and absolutely, or (if you like those terms better) fully and perfectly justified, either by our Words or Works? Those places that require forgiving of others, that so God may forgive us, shew indeed, that it is no true Justifying Faith which doth not, as occasion requires, manifest it self in that kind: but we are not therefore justified as well by forgiving others, as by believing; nor doth the forgiving of others concur with Faith unto Justification. That in 1 *John* 1. 9. and *Acts* 3. 19. shews that Repentance must go before Justification, and is required unto Justification, but not so as Faith is required.

Repen-

Multa requiruntur ad Justificationem quæ non justificant Amef. *loco ante citato.*

Repentance is required, that we may be justified, but not that we may be justified by it, as we are by Faith, though Instrumentally and Relatively, as it apprehendeth Christ's Righteousnefs by which we are justified. For Prayer, it is a Fruit of Faith, and therefore called, *The Prayer of Faith*, Jam. 5. 15.

[*Repentance* (faith Mr. *Ball* Of the Coven. c. 3. p. 18.) *is the Condition of Faith, and the Qualification of a Person capable of Salvation: but Faith alone is the Cause of Justification and Salvation on our part required*].

And immediately after he adds; [*It is a penitent and petitioning Faith, whereby we receive the promises of Mercy; but we are not justified, partly by Prayer, partly by Repentance, but by that Faith which stirreth up Godly sorrow for sin, and inforceth us to pray for Pardon and Salvation*].

And again; [*Prayer is nothing else but the Stream or River of Faith, and an issue of the desire of that which joyfully we believe*]. Of Faith, *Part* 1. *Chap.* 8. *pag.* 105.

For that place, *Acts* 22. 16. the Exposition which I gave of it in the *Animadversions*, is confirmed by this, That the nature of a Sacrament is to signifie and seal, as the Apostle shews, *Rom.* 4. 11.

Quatenus ergò fidem nostram adjuvat Baptismus, (inquit Calvinus) *ut remissionem peccatorum percipiat ex solo Christi sanguine, Lavacrum anima vocatur. Ita ablutio, cujus meminit* Lucas, *non causam designat; sed ad sensum* Pauli *refertur, qui symbolo accepto, peccata sua esse expiata* (*N. B.*) *melius cognovit.—Cum testimonium haberet* Paulus *gratiæ Dei, jam illis remissa erant peccata. Non igitur Baptismo demum ablutus est, sed novam gratiæ, quam adeptus erat, confirmationem accepit.*

That *Paul*'s sins were but incompleatly washed away by Faith until he was baptized, your Similitudes (which are too often your only proofs) do not prove. Yea, a Kings Coronation, (of which you speak) when the Kingdom is hereditary, is (I think) but a confirmation of what was done before.

The purifying of the Heart spoken of, 1 *Pet.* 1. 22. is (I conceive) to be understood as *Jam.* 4. 8. & *Jer.* 4. 14. viz.

viz. of purifying from the filth of sin by Sanctification. And for 1 *Pet.* 4. 18. who denies the diligence of the Righteous to be a means of their Salvation! But what is that to prove Works to concur with Faith unto Justification?

1. I take what you grant, That at first believing a Man is justified so fully, as that he is acquitted from the guilt of all Sin, and from all Condemnation. And surely at the last one can have no fuller Justification than this is. That afterwards he is acquitted from the guilt of more sins, is not to the purpose, seeing he is acquitted from all at first, and but from all at last, though this [all] be more at last than at first. Otherwise the Justification of one who hath fewer sins, should not be so full as the Justification of him, whose sins are more in number. 76, & 77.

2. That there is a further Condition of Justification afterward than at first, hath been said often, but was never yet proved.

3. That which you call Sentential Justification, (*viz.* at the Last Judgment) I hold to be only the manifestation of that Justification which was before. That because Obedience is a Condition of Salvation, heretofore it is also a Condition of Justification, I deny (as you see) all along in the *Animadversions*, and therefore I thought it enough here to touch that, which you say of full Justification, especially seeing your self hold Obedience to be no Condition of Justification at first. You lay the weight of your 78*th* Thesis upon the word [full] which therefore was enough for me to take hold of.

For your Queries therefore about Sentential Justification at Judgment, I have told you my mind before, and you might sufficiently understand it by the *Animadversions*.

When you prove, 1. that Justification at Judgment is a Justification distinct from Justification here, and not only a manifestation of it.

2. That Justification at Judgment hath the same Conditions with Salvation, as taken for the accomplishment of it, *viz.* Glorification.

And, 3. That consequently Obedience is a Condition of Justification at Judgment. When you shall prove (I say) these things, I shall see more than yet I do.

In the mean while, besides what hath been said before, hear

Loc. 31. *quæst.* 46. hear what *Bucan* ſaith to this purpoſe; *An perficitur juſtificatio noſtra in hâc vitâ? In Juſtificatione quemadmodum judicamur, & re ipſa utamur à Deo juſti, ita etiam adjudicamur vitæ æternæ. Ratione igitur decreti divini, & ſententiæ ipſius de vitâ æternâ prolatæ à Deo judice; item ratione juſtitiæ, quam imputat nobis Judex Cæleſtis, jam perfecta eſt juſtificatio noſtra in hâc vitâ, niſi quòd in alterâ magis patefacienda (N. B.) ſit ac revelanda eadem illa juſtitia imputata, & arctiùs etiam nobis applicanda. Ea tamen tota perficitur in hâc vitâ, in quâ poteſt homo dici plenè perfectèque juſtificatus. Filii Dei ſumus (ergo juſtificati) ſed nondum patefactum eſt quis erimus,* 1 John 3. 2. *At ſi executionem reſpicias, & rationem habeas vitæ, & gloriæ, quæ nobis adjudicatur, & quæ nobis inhæſura eſt, quia in nobis non perficitur in hâc vitâ, imperfecta etiam Juſtificatio in hâc vitâ cenſeri poteſt.*

Non impediunt vitii originalis reſidui macula illa, quin etiam in hâc vitâ perfecta ſit juſtificatio. Quæ revera nec intenditur, nec remittitur, rem ipſam quod attinet. Gataker. *contra* Gomarum. *p.* 26, 27.

1. I think there is not the like right of Salvation and Juſtification, but that although we muſt be ſaved by Works, though not by the Merit of them, yet we cannot be juſtified by Works, except it be by the merit of them. My reaſon is, Becauſe that whereby we are juſtified, muſt fully ſatisfie the Law; for it muſt fully acquit us from all Condemnation, which otherwiſe by the Law will fall upon us. This Works cannot do, except they be fully conform to the Law, and ſo be meritorious, as far forth as the Creature can merit of the Creator. But being juſtified by Faith, *i. e.* by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt through Faith imputed to us, and ſo put into a ſtate of Salvation, we muſt yet ſhew our Faith by our Works; which though they be imperfect, and ſo not meritorious, yet make way for the full enjoyment of Salvation. And me-thinks the Scripture is ſo frequent and clear in diſtinguiſhing betwixt Juſtification and Salvation, as to the full enjoyment of it, that it may ſeem ſtrange that you ſhould ſo confound them as you do, and argue as if there were the ſame reaſon of the one as of the other.

2. You might eaſily ſee, that by [*Via Regni*] as oppoſed to [*Cauſa Regnandi*]; I meant only to exclude the Merit of Works, not to deny Works to be a Means and

and a Condition required of us for the obtaining of compleat Salvation. Salvation is a Chain consisting of many Links, but so is not Justification; it is but one Link of that Chain.

3. If all the World of Divines be against this, That Justification at Judgment is but a Declaration of our Justification here; I have hitherto (it seems) been in some other World. For truly (so far as I observe) both Scripture and Divines usually speak of Justification, as we here partake of it. As for Justification at Judgment, it is but rarely touched, either in Scripture or in other Writings: Neither (so far as I can see) will it consist with either, to make Justification at Judgment a compleating of our Justification, as if before we were but imperfectly justified: but rather they shew, that our Justification is then fully declared and made manifest, and that then we come to the full enjoyment of that benefit, which we have right unto by our Justification, *viz.* Glorification. *For whom he justified, them he also glorified*, Rom. 8. 30. I have spoken enough of this before; but you do so continually repeat the same things, that I am forced also to repeat things oftner than I would.

1. That Justification by Sentence, *viz.* at the Last Judgment, and Continued Justification, are several kinds of Justification distinct from Justification begun, and have several Conditions, you continually affirm, or suppose, but never prove. *Ibid.*

2. My debate with you was about those words, [*That which we are justified by, we are saved by*]; and [*the full possession or enjoyment of Salvation*]. What your reply is to the purpose, I cannot see. And besides, you had need to clear those words, [*In justifying it is the same thing to give a right to a thing, and to give the thing it self*]. For if you mean, That as soon as a right to a thing is given by Justification, the thing it self also is actually given; it appears to me far otherwise. For I think that Justification presently gives a right to Glorification; For what doth debar from that right, but sin? Now the guilt of sin is done away by Justification; therefore there is a present right too to Glorification, yet no present enjoyment of it. How I do yeeld your Assertion, you do not shew.

Ibid. Your Repetitions indeed have been troubleſome unto me. I grant here more than you deſire, *viz.* That not only to morrow there will be Condemnation to him that ſhall not ſincerely obey, but even to day there is condemnation to him; his Faith being not prompt and ready to bring forth the Fruit of Obedience, is not ſuch as doth juſtifie him at all. But though Faith, whereby we are juſtified, muſt and will ſhew it ſelf by Works, yet we are not therefore juſtified by Works as well as by Faith. *Paul* doth exclude Works, as well from Juſtification afterward as at firſt, *viz.* as concurring with Faith unto the Effect of Juſtifying: for he ſhews that *Abraham* was juſtified, not only at firſt, but alſo afterward, by Faith and not by Works, *Rom.* 4. 2, 3. And *James* doth require Works as well to Juſtification at firſt as afterward, *viz.* as Fruits of that Faith whereby we are juſtified. For otherwiſe he ſaith it is a dead Faith, ineffectual and unprofitable. Though Works do not preſently appear upon our firſt believing, yet if they do not appear in due ſeaſon, that Faith doth not juſtifie: Such a Believer doth not ceaſe to be, but indeed never was in Chriſt, *viz.* as a juſtified Perſon is in him.

Ibid. How is Juſtification at Judgment a declaring of a Righteouſneſs in queſtion? The Word of God (the truth whereof is unqueſtionable) aſſures us that all true Believers are juſtified. And that ſuch and ſuch were true Believers, God by his Word and Spirit did evidence unto them before, though then he will make it more fully evident unto all! That Satan ſhall publickly accuſe at the Laſt Judgment, is more than I ſee either Scripture or Reaſon for. He ſhall then be judged himſelf, and that in ſome ſort by the Saints, 1 *Cor.* 6. 3. He ſhall then have little courage to accuſe the Saints, though now he doth it.

Yet I queſtion alſo whether Satan do at any time directly put up unto God any Accuſations againſt the Saints. He ſeems to be called *the Accuſer of the Brethren*, *Apoc.* 12. 10. becauſe by his Inſtruments he is ever* traducing and ſlandering them. He is ſaid to accuſe them, κατηγορῶν τῶν Θεοῦ, before God, or in the ſight of God; not τῷ Θεῷ, unto God, as the unjuſt Steward was accuſed to his Maſter, διεβλήθη αὐτῷ, *Luke* 16. 1. That in

* See Mr. *Mede* on the place.

in *Job* 1. & 2. seems to be parabolically expressed. Satan knows his Accusations against the Saints to be false: Therefore he knows it is to little purpose to accuse them unto God. Especially at the Last Judgment, by the very separating of the Elect from the Reprobate, he will see that it is in vain to bring any Accusation against the Elect: and therefore how there should then be any such publick Accuser, or any question of the Righteousness of the Saints, I do not see: besides, that excepting those who will be found alive at Christ's coming, all have received their doom before, though not so openly as then they shall. That Obedience is a Condition of Glorification, not of right unto it, but of possession and enjoyment of it, I here and every-where confess.

1. What mean you by those words, [*Doth Obedience get Faith?*] Doth any such thing follow, upon that which I say? But you say, [*If Obedience only manifest Faith, how then doth it procure Right?*] *Ibid.* & 78.

Answ. It is not said, That Obedience doth procure right, but only thus much is signified, That none can have right without Obedience, as the Fruit of that Faith by which right is procured. As I said before of Works, so I say now of keeping the Commandments, (which doth comprehend in it all good Works) it is spoken of only as a Fruit of Faith, which Faith indeed doth (Instrumentally and Relatively) procure Right.

For the words of *James* I have said enough before; I have neither list nor leisure to repeat the same things continually upon every occasion. What your multitude of other Texts is, I do not know; but if they be not more forced, than by my Opinion the words of *James* are, there will be little cause to complain of the forcing of them.

2. That Faith without Obedience doth give right at first, you grant: The same right (I hold) is still continued only by Faith; though Faith, if not of such a Nature as to produce Obedience, can neither give right at first, nor afterward continue it. Though Repentance must go before Justification, yet Faith alone may justifie, and so give right; which though it be not the same with Justifying, yet it is necessarily joined with it.

3. *Jus in re*, I take to be such a Right, as from which the Possession it self is not, nor can be separated.

4. The Text doth not ascribe *Jus ad rem* to Obedience, but only *Declarativè*: as a Fruit of Faith it maketh it appear, that there is such a Right which Faith hath procured.

5. I do indeed believe, That a Man may have, and hath *Jus ad Gloriam* without Obedience, even as he is justified without Obedience. For certainly as soon as a Man is justified, he hath *Jus ad Gloriam*. For what doth hinder but sin, the guilt of which by Justification is done away? Yet still I say, Faith which doth justifie, and so gives right to Glory, will shew it self by Obedience. Those words [*If he live to Age*] are needless: for we speak continually of the Justification of such as are of Age. But how can you seriously ask me this Question, when your self put it out of all question, holding that a Man (that is of Age, I presume) is at first justified, and consequently (as I think you will not deny) hath *Jus ad Gloriam*, by Faith without Obedience?

6. It is no debasing of Faith to say, That after it, as a Fruit of it, Obedience is required to give *Jus in re*, *i. e.* to bring into the actual possession of Glory. How can you pretend this to be a debasing of Faith, who debase it much more in making it unsufficient to give *Jus ad rem*, except there be Obedience concurrent with it? Though yet herein you do not keep fair correspondence with your self, without a distinction of *Jus Inchoatum*, and *Jus Continuatum*; which distinction how it will hold good, I do not see.

78. If any shall think that you have said enough to prove, That we are justified by a Personal Righteousness, I shall think that such are soon satisfied.

Ibid. 1. When we speak of Justification, we speak of it as taking off all Accusation, and as opposed to all Condemnation. And what Righteousness is sufficient for this, but that which is perfect?

2. That *Lud. de Dieu* hath not the same Doctrine on *Rom.* 8. 4. as you deliver, I have sufficiently shewed before: And if he had, I take the Authority of *Calvin* and *Davenant* (whom I cited, and to whom many others might be added) to be of more force against it, than *de Dieus*

Dieu's could be for it. That Holineſs and Obedience is neceſſary unto Salvation, ſo that no Salvation is to be expected without it, it were pitty (as I ſaid in the *Animadverſions*) any ſhould deny: but to argue from Salvation to Juſtification, Dr. *Fulk* told the *Rhemiſts*, is Pelting Sophiſtry: Yet you ſeem to wonder that I make a great difference between the Condition of Juſtification, and the Condition of Salvation. As for Right to Salvation that's another thing: as Faith alone doth juſtifie, ſo it alone gives Right to Salvation: Yet becauſe this Faith is of a working Nature, therefore before the actual Enjoyment of Salvation, Faith, as occaſion doth require, will ſhew it ſelt by Obedience; and that is all which the Apoſtle teacheth *Rom.* 8. 13. On *Jam.* 2. 24.

Verum eſt quidem (ſaith *Calvin*) *nos ſolâ Dei miſericordiâ juſtificari in Chriſto: ſed aquè & iſtud verum ac certum, omnes qui juſtificantur vocari à Domino, ut dignè ſuâ vocatione vivant.* Ad Loc.

It is true, He that proved a Man lived not after the fleſh, but mortified it, doth juſtifie him from that Accuſation, That he is worthy of Death: but that is only, becauſe a Man's not living after the fleſh, but mortifying it, proves the truth of his Faith, whereby he hath intereſt in Chriſt, and ſo is freed from all Condemnation, as the Apoſtle clearly ſheweth *Rom.* 8. 1. If that be a *Reatus* to make Faith only the Condition of Juſtification, yet Obedience alſo a Condition of Glorification. I ſay with the Oratour, *Quod maximè accuſatori optandum eſt, habes confitentem reum*: But what *Reatus* there is in this, I do not ſee, nor could our choiceſt Divines (it ſeems) ſee any in it.

River ſaith, that *Opera ſequuntur Juſtificationem, ſed præcedunt Glorificationem*; the words were cited more at large before. Colleg. Controverſ. Diſp. 36.

So *Ameſius*; *Nos non negamus bona opera ullam relationem ad ſalutem habere: habent enim relationem adjuncti conſequentis, & effecti ad ſalutem* (*ut loquuntur*) *adeptam, & adjuncti antecedentis ac diſponentis ad ſalutem adipiſcendam.* Contra Bellar. tom. 4. l. 6. c. 6. in initio.

Thus alſo *Davenant*, (*De Juſtit. Actual. cap.* 32. *ſub initio*;) *Verum eſt, nos negare bona opera requiri, ut Conditiones Salutis noſtræ, ſi per bona opera intelliga-*

mus exactè bona, & quæ Legis rigori respondeant: si etiam per Conditiones salutis intelligamus Conditiones fœderis, quibus recipimur in favorem Dei, & ad jus (N.B.) æternæ vitæ. Hæc enim pendent ex solâ condistone fidei Christum Mediatorem apprehendentis. At falsum est, nos negare bona opera requiri, ut Conditiones salutis; si per bona opera intelligamus illos fructus inchoatæ justitiæ, quæ sequuntur justificationem, & (N.B.) præcedunt glorificationem, ut via ordinata ad eandem.

What some Divines in their private Contests with you may do I know not; I shew what eminent Divines in their publick Writings do deliver, even the same that I maintain, *viz.* That Faith alone is the Condition of Justification, and of right to Salvation and Glory: and yet that Works are also requisite as the Fruits of that Faith, and as making way for the actual enjoyment of Glory.

For the term [*Instrument*], I was not willing to wrangle about it, neither am I willing to strive about words. Yet I told you, I thought it might well enough be used as our Divines do use it. And I always let you know, That thô perhaps Faith may more fitly be called a Condition, yet not so as to make it to be merely *Causa sine quâ non*, but so as to ascribe some Causality and Efficiency unto it in respect of Justification, *viz.* in that it apprehendeth and receiveth Christ's Righteousness; by which through Faith imputed unto us we are justified.

Of the Coven. c. 6. p. 70.

[*Faith* (saith Mr. *Ball*) *is not a bare Condition, without which the thing cannot be*, (*for that is no cause at all*) *but an Instrumental Cause*, &c.]

This (as you might see by many Passages) is the very reason why (I think) the Scripture doth attribute Justification to Faith alone, and not to Works, nor any other Grace besides Faith; because only Faith doth embrace Christ and his Righteousness. Though therefore I neither was, nor am willing λογομαχεῖν, yet I neither did, nor do disclaim the word [*Instrument*] as unmeet to be used.

And indeed seeing Faith hath some Causality in Justifying, what Cause it should be rather than Instrumental, I do not know.

Hear

Hear Mr. *Ball* again, if you please, [*If when we speak of the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace, by Condition we understand whatsoever is required on our part, as precedent, concomitant, and subsequent to Justification, Repentance, Faith and Obedience are all Conditions: but if by Condition we understand what is on our part required as the Cause of the good promised, though only Instrumental, Faith or Belief in the Promise is the only Condition*]. Of the Coven. c. 3. p. 20.

And again; [*Faith is a necessary and lively Instrument of Justification, which is among the number of true Causes, not being a Cause without which the thing is not done, but a Cause whereby it is done. The Cause without which a thing is not done, is only present in the action, and doth nothing therein; but as the Eye is an active Instrument for Seeing, and the Ear for Hearing; so is Faith also for Justifying. If it be demanded whose Instrument it is? It is the Instrument of the Soul, wrought therein by the Holy Ghost, and is the free Gift of God*]. *Ibid.* p. 19.

So *Amesius* when *Bellarmine* objected; *Sacramenta promissiones applicant, & nostras faciunt? non ergo per modum instrumenti applicantis fides sola justificat.* *Contra Bell. tom. 4 lib. 5. c. 4. ad 11.*

He answers; *Sola tamen ex iis, quæ sunt in nobis, vel à nobis erga Deum: sola fides accipiendo: quia Sacramenta sunt à Deo erga nos, & Promissionem applicant, ut instrumenta dandi, non accipiendi.*

Thus then is Faith taken for an Instrument of Justification, in that by Faith we receive the Promise, or Christ promised, by whom we are justified.

Bellarmine again objecting; *Hoc non multum refert: nam utrumque est instrumentum Dei.*

He answers; *Plurimum refert, quia sicut Sacramenta quamvis aliquo sensu possint dici instrumenta nostra, quatenus per illa tanquam per media assequimur finem nostrum, propriè tamen sunt instrumenta Dei: sic etiam Fides, quamvis possit vocari instrumentum Dei, quia Deus justificat nos ex fide & per fidem,* Rom. 3. 20. *propriè tamen est instrumentum nostrum. Deus nos baptizat, & pascit, non nosmetipsi; nos credimus in Christum, non Deus.*

If you desire more to this purpose, besides what hath been said before, I refer you to Mr. *Blake* of the Cove-

nant, *chap.* 12. and Mr. *Kendal* againſt Mr. *Goodwin*, chap. 4.

79. 1. The non-fulfilling of the Condition of the New-Covenant doth condemn, yet it is by the Law, and for the tranſgreſſing of it that any are condemned; there being no freedom from Condemnation, but by the New-Covenant, nor any by it without fulfilling the Condition of it. Such as do not embrace the New-Covenant, and that on the terms upon which it is made, are left to the Condemnation of the Old-Covenant, which will be ſo much the ſorer, as the Sin in deſpiſing the Mercy offered is the greater. So that ſtill (as I ſaid in the *Animadverſions*) the fulfilling of the Law, *viz.* Chriſt's fulfilling it for us, is that by which we are juſtified, though Faith be required of us, that Chriſt's fulfilling of the Law may be imputed unto us, and ſo we may be juſtified by it.

The Accuſations which you ſpeak of, *viz.* 1. Of not fulfilling the Condition of the New-Covenant. 2. Of having therefore no part in Chriſt. 3. Of being guilty moreover of far ſorer puniſhment.

All theſe Accuſations (as I have often ſaid) are but a re-inforcing of that Accuſation, That we are guilty of tranſgreſſing the Law, and ſo to be condemned; and therefore the more guilty, and the more to be condemned, becauſe freedom from that Guilt and Condemnation might have been obtained, and was neglected; ſee *Acts* 13. 38, 41. *Heb.* 2. 3.

2. The Goſpel doth not joyn Obedience with Faith as the Condition of our right unto Salvation, though it require Obedience as a Fruit of that Faith, whereby we obtain that Right, and ſo as the way or means whereby to enter into the actual enjoyment of Salvation.

3. You might ſee that I do not yeeld the Theſis, wherein you make Faith and Obedience ſo to be Conditions of the New-Covenant, as withal to be Conditions of Juſtification; This both now and every-where I deny.

Ibid. 1. If it be not much (as you ſay) to your purpoſe; Why do you alledg it? That Chriſt did not receive either of the Sacraments for that end as we receive them, who can queſtion?

2. If you judg it uncertain, whether *Luke* or *Matthew*

them did relate those words, [*I will not drink hence-forth, &c.*] out of due place, why are you so peremptory in your *Aphorisms* as to say, [*Luke doth clearly speak of two Cups, and doth subjoin these words to the first, which was before the Sacramental*]?

3. Why do you call that Supposition, [*If* Luke *had not written*] a merry one? Is it ridiculous to suppose such a thing?

Let us suppose (says Mr. *Cawdrey* and Mr. *Palmer*) *that Question had not been put to our Saviour, and that the Apostle had not written his Epistle to the* Ephesians, *&c.*] Of the Sabbath, Part 2. c. 6. p. 227.

May not one as well sport with this Supposition of theirs, as you with that of mine? *Luke* himself shews, That he wrote his Gospel after others, *Luk.* 1. 1. Probable it is, that he wrote after *Matthew* and *Mark*: And how should any reading only these, imagine that those words [*I will not drink*, &c.] were meant of any other than the Sacramental Cup, they not making mention (no not in appearance) of any other?

Apud Matthæum (*inquit* Amef.) 26. 29. *pronomen istud demonstrativum*, [*ex hoc fructu vitis*] *necessario refertur ad illud, quod precedentibus verbis fuit eodem pronomine demonstratum*, [*Hoc est sanguis meus*]. Contra Bellar. Tom. 3. l. 4. c. 1. §. 48.

Though *Matthew* and *Mark* had not written, yet it had been no such boldness to suppose *Luke* to relate some words out of that order wherein they were spoken, such Anticipations (as I said, and you do not gain-say it) being usual in the Scripture.

Thus again *Amesius*: *Ex ipso* Luca (*quamvis ibi transponantur verba*) *contra colligitur aperte, illa verba pertinere ad Calicem Mysticum & Sacramentalem Cœnæ Domini. Nam cap.* 22. 17. *dicitur Dominus gratias egisse super illud poculum, in quo dicit fructum vitis postea mansisse, eodem modo quo* v. 19. *gratias egit super panem. Hæc autem gratiarum actione intelligi benedictionem & Consecrationem Sacramentalem concedit* Bellarminus, *cap.* 10. &c. *Ib.*

1. It is such a Justification, as the Apostle where he doth professedly treat of that Subject, doth scarce ever mention: nor yet do Divines use to speak of it. Therefore your [*totus Mundus Theologorum Reformatorum*], *Ibid.* & 80.

is

is *Vox, praterea nihil.* Why do you alledge none of them? *Juris consultos enim in hâc causâ minùs moror.* But and if we maintain the word [*Justification*] is taken *in sensu forensi*; What of that? May it not yet nevertheless be, as I suppose it is, *viz.* That Justification at the Last Judgment is only a full manifestation of that Justification which we have here, and not (as you affirm) our actual, most proper and compleat Justification, as if here our Justification were but potential, less proper and incompleat?

Medul. lib. 1. c. 27. §. 7. *Amesius* handling this Point, saith, *Justificatio est sententia pronuntiatio, & non physicam aliquam aut realem commutationem denotat in S. literis, sed forensem aut moralem illam, quæ in Sententiæ pronuntiatione & reputatione consistit.*

Yet he hath nothing at all (that I see) of Justification at the Great Judgment; much less that it is the actual, most proper and compleat Justification.

Ibid. § 9. He saith moreover; *Sententia hæc fuit*; 1. *in mente Dei quasi concepta per modum decreti justificandi.* 2. *Fuit in Christo capite nostro à mortuis jam resurgente pronuntiata.* 3. *Virtualiter pronuntiatur ex primâ illa relatione, quæ ex fide ingeneratâ exurgit.* 4. *Expressè pronunciatur per Spiritum Dei testantem Spiritibus nostris reconciliationem nostram cum Deo.* —*In hoc testimonio Spiritus non tam propriè ipsa justificatio consistit, quàm actualis antèâ concessæ perceptio, per actum fidei quasi reflexum.*

But as for the pronouncing of this Sentence at the Last Judgment, he doth not so much as make any mention of it. Neither doth *Calvin* (that I find) in his Institutions, though he treat at large of Justification, and that *in sensu forensi*, speak any thing of Justification at the Last Judgment; nor indeed any that I meet with, except it be on the by, as *Bucanus* and *Maccovius*, who agree with me, as I have shewed before.

2. If the Fruits of Faith be inquired after, That so Faith may appear true and genuine, such as doth indeed receive Christ, and so justifie; Is not this a sufficient reason why they are inquired after? But in that which follows about *via ad Regnum*, &c. you are quite *extra viam.* You forget that we are now about Justification;

or

or at leaſt that I do not make the Condition of Juſtification and of Salvation every way the ſame as you ſometimes do. This may ſuffice for your two firſt Objections.

To the Third and Fourth, I anſwer in the words of that Reverend and Learned *Davenant*; *Particula* [*Enim*] *non ſemper rei cauſam denotat, ſed illationis conſequentiam, ſive à cauſa, ſive ab effecto, ſive à ſigno, ſeu undecunque petitam;* — *Sic quando Chriſtus dicit electis, Venite benedicti, &c. Eſurivi enim, &c. particula illa non cum cauſa ſalutis, ſed cum ſigno cauſæ connectitur. Nam illa bona opera, quæ ibi recenſentur, ſunt ſigna veræ fidei, adoptionis, inſitionis in Chriſtum, prædeſtinationis ac favoris divini, quæ ſunt veræ cauſæ ſalutis.* *De Juſtit. Habit. cap. 32. ad Obiect. 9.*

Maccovius *de Juſtific. Diſp. 10. Juſtificatur quis ex operibus apud Deum non juſtificatione cauſæ, ſed juſtificatione effecti & ſigni.*

You are therefore too free and forward in ſaying, That the Uſes pretended for this enquiring after mere Signs are frivolous. What though the buſineſs at Judgment be to enquire of the Cauſe, and to ſentence accordingly? May not the Cauſe (take it in the Law-ſenſe) be made to appear by Signs, even as the Cauſe (in the Logical-ſenſe) doth appear by the Effect, and the Tree by the Fruit? That Obedience is *ipſa Cauſa, de qua quæritur*, the terms [*Therefore*] and [*Becauſe*] do not prove, no more than the term [*For*]. And here I may with better reaſon ſay than you did, *Appello totum Mundum Theologorum Reformatorum.*

But here I muſt mind you of one thing, which (it ſeems) you do not obſerve, *viz.* That thoſe terms which you build upon, [*Becauſe*] and [*Therefore*] are neither in the Original, nor any Tranſlation (tha. I know) except the Vulgar Latin, which hath *Quia.*

Bellarmine urging theſe Particles, *Ameſius* anſwers, *Mat. 25. 21, 23. Nulla particula reperitur niſi in Verſione non probanda. Contra* Bellar. *Tom. 4. lib. 7. cap. 2. ad 3.*

1. You cite abundance of Texts, but to what purpoſe? You would have me try whether they ſpeak only of Signs, or or Conditions. Conditions of what do you mean? Of Juſtification? That you are to prove: but how 80.

how it can be proved by any of those Texts, I cannot see. They speak of the necessity of Obedience unto Salvation, of God's rendring unto Men according to their Deeds, of the reward of good Works, &c. But doth it therefore follow, that Obedience and good Works are Conditions of Justification? I am loth to be so plain with you, as sometimes you are with me, otherwise I could say, I have seldom seen so many places of Scripture alledged to so little purpose. Some of those places you seem to lay more weight upon, as *John* 16. 27. and 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. and 1 *John* 3. 22, 23. For here you do not only note the places, but you also cite the words, as if they were more especially to be observed.

Now for that *Joh.* 16. 27. [*The Father hath loved you, because you have loved me*]; What do you inter from thence? That Works justifie as part of the Condition of Justification? If this be a good Consequence, I may say, *Reddat mihi minam qui me docuit Dialecticam.*

1. Works and Love differ as well as Works, though Works flow both from Love and Faith.

In Loc. *Calvin* makes those words [*because you have loved me*], to denote an unfeigned Faith, which proceedeth from a sincere Affection, here called Love. And I grant that such a Love, *viz.* of Desire doth go before Justifying Faith.

3. God doth love those that love him, and that love Christ, *amore amicitiæ*; yet *amore benevolentiæ*, he loves us before we love him, 1 *Joh.* 4. 10, 19.

Ibid. *Secundum hanc rationem* (*inquit* Calvinus) *hîc dicimur amari à Deo, dum Christum diligimus, quia pignus habemus paternæ ejus dilectionis, &c.*

That in 2 *Cor.* 5. 10 [*according to*, &c.] avails your Cause nothing. For may not Works be considered at the Last Judgment, so as that we shall receive according to them, and yet be no part of the Condition of Justification, but only Fruits of that Faith whereby we are justified? So for that in *Joh.* 3. 22. [*because we keep his Commandments*, &c.]

In Loc. I say with *Calvin*; *Non intelligit fundatam esse in operibus nostris orandi fiduciam; sed in hoc tantùm insistit, non posse à fide disjungi pietatem, & sincerum Dei cultum.*

cultum. Nec abſurdum videri debet, quod particulam Cauſalem (N. B.) uſurpet, utcunque de cauſâ non diſputetur. Nam accidens inſeparabile interdum Cauſæ loco poni ſolet. Quemadmodum ſiquis dicat, Quia Sol Meridie ſupra nos lucet, plus tunc eſſe caloris. Neque enim ſequitur ex luce oriri calorem.

1. You ſhall confound Juſtification and Salvation, betwixt which (you know) I make a great difference. *Ibid.*

2. I ſee not that any of the Texts alledged do prove Obedience to be concurrent with Faith unto Juſtification, or to Right to Salvation. Obedience is an Argument *à poſteriore* of our Right unto Salvation, and *à priore* a means of our enjoyment of it. More than this by any Text of Scripture (I preſume) will not be proved.

Your Firſt and Second have nothing but mere Words. *Ibid.*

Ad 3. I anſwer, No more is the word [*Juſtification*] in any of the Texts which you cited.

Ad 4. What trick do you mean? Or what prejudice? Do you ſo wonder at this, That I cannot be perſwaded by any of your Allegations, that we are juſtified by our perſonal Righteouſneſs? Or that Works concur with Faith unto Juſtification, as being part of the Condition that the Goſpel doth require, that thereby we may be juſtified? Then all Proteſtant Divines are Men to be wondred at, or at leaſt never conſidered the Texts, which you alledg; and ſurely that were a great wonder.

Ad 5. For Juſtification at Judgment, I will ſay no more until I ſee more proof of your Opinion about it.

Ad 6. The Qualifications ſpoken of tend to that end, That we may enjoy Salvation, but not that we may have right to Salvation: They only manifeſt that Right, which by Faith in Chriſt we do obtain.

Ad 7. Of *James* his words enough already.

Ad 8. I wiſh you were more Argumentative, and leſs Cenſorious, or at leaſt more wary in expreſſing your cenſure. To ſay [*It is next to non-ſenſe*] is over-broad; If you had ſaid, That you could ſee no good ſenſe in it, this had not been ſo much, as truly I cannot in your words. For may not a thing be ſpoken by way of Sentence, and yet by way of Argumentation too? I think, Yes, when a reaſon is given of the Sentence. But what

ſhould

ſhould that in *Luke* 19. 17. force me to confeſs? That Works are more than Fruits of Faith, by which we are juſtified?

Why do you ſtand ſo much upon the word [*Becauſe*], when as you acknowledg that Works are no proper cauſe? May it not be ſaid, [This is a good Tree, becauſe it bringeth forth good Fruit?] and yet the goodneſs of the Tree is before the goodneſs of its Fruit; and this is but only a manifeſtation of the other. So what ſhould I ſee in *Luk.* 19. 27? That none ſhould be ſaved by Chriſt, but ſuch as are obedient unto him, that I ſee; but not that Obedience is that whereby we are (at leaſt in part) juſtified. Yea, I think it worthy your conſideration, That the Texts which you alledg and build upon, ſpeaking only of Works and Obedience, and not of Faith at all, either muſt be interpreted, That Obedience and Works are neceſſary Fruits of Juſtifying Faith, or elſe they will reach further than you would have them, even to make Obedience and Works the only Condition of Juſtification at Judgment.

Ad 9. Where you performed that, I know not: But however your Work was not to overthrow any Arguments for Merits, (for which I am far from urging) but to anſwer my reaſon, which I urged, why thoſe Scriptures which you alledged, might rather ſeem to make Works meritorious of Salvation, than to concur with Faith unto Juſtification, *viz.* becauſe they follow Juſtification, but go before Salvation. I know you will ſay, That they go before Juſtification as Continued and Conſummate at Judgment: but for the overthrowing of that, I need ſay no more till you ſay more in defence of it.

81. The Texts which you alledg ſpeak only of Obedience: and ſo if you will think to prove by them, That Obedience is the Condition of our Juſtification; you may as well ſay, That it is the only Condition, and ſo quite exclude Faith, which is not mentioned in thoſe Texts. If you ſay, It is in other Texts; ſo (ſay I) do other Texts ſhew that Faith is the only Condition, and that Obedience is not concurrent with Faith unto Juſtification, though it neceſſarily flow from that Faith by which we are juſtified. That may be alledged as the reaſon of the Juſtifying Sentence, which yet is but the Fruit and Effect

of

of Justifying Faith. If *Sententia* be *Præmii Adjudicatio*, then (I think) *Causa Sententiæ* must be also *Causa Præmii adjudicati*. The word [*For*], when we say [*Justified for Faith*], must note either the formal, or the meritorious Cause: the *ratio Sententiæ* may be drawn from that, which is neither the formal nor the meritorious Cause of Justification, nor yet a Condition or Instrument of it, but only a Fruit and Effect of that which is so.

3. The Scripture doth not say, That Works do justifie us in that sense as you take it, *viz.* as joint Conditions with Faith of Justification.

4. I think it not so proper to say, [We must be judged, and receive our Reward by our Works] as [according to our Works]. And however, to be judged by our Works, is not as much as to be justified by them, otherwise than as they are Fruits and Effects of Faith, and so manifest our Interest in Christ, by whom all that believe are justified, *Acts* 13. 39.

5. Your [*For*] must needs be the same with [*Propter*]. When you say, [*We are justified for Faith*] surely in Latin it must be *propter Fidem*. Here [*enim*] will not be suitable.

1. That which I intimated is this, That in respect of God, such an outward judicial Proceeding needed not, no more than God doth need a Sign. Whether the Judicial Proceeding be all upon mere Signs, and the *Ipsa Causa Justitiæ* not meddled with, is not to the purpose. Though why may not that which is in some respect *Justitia Causæ*, and so *Justitia Personæ quoad istam Causam*, be *Signum Fidei, & per consequens Justitiæ Christi nobis per Fidem imputatæ, qua simpliciter & absolutè justificamur*? *Ibid.*

2. and 3. That which is the Condition of Glorification, is not therefore the Condition of Justification, or of right to Glorification, which doth immediately flow from Justification, or at least is inseparably joined with it. No Man can be accused to be *Reus Pœnæ*, and so to have no right to Glorification; but he that is accused to be *Reus Culpæ*: and from that Accusation we are justified by Faith, which is made manifest by our Works.

1. I perceive I did mistake your meaning, the context- *Ibid.*

ture

ture of your words being such, that one might easily mistake the meaning of them.

2. Your Affirmation is no Proof; and as well may you say, That because in other places of Scripture the Righteous are usually spoken of in respect of Personal Righteousness, in opposition to the wicked and ungodly, therefore all those places prove, That Personal Righteousness is that whereby we are justified. Because we must have a Righteousness inherent in us, as well as a Righteousness imputed to us: are we therefore justified as well by the one as the other? *Appello Evangelium pariter ac totum Mundum Theologorum Reformatorum.*

Ibid. & 82. 1. Your *Aphorisms* tend to prove Justification by Works, to which end you press the words of St. *James*, and reject the Interpretation which our Divines give of them.

2. *Paul* indeed and *James* did not consider Works in the same sense. For *Paul* considered them as concurring with Faith unto Justification, and so rejected them: but *James* looked at them as Fruits of Justifying-Faith, and so asserted the necessity of them. You do not rightly understand *Paul*'s words, *Rom.* 4. 4. of which I have spoken before. He doth not speak absolutely; for so he should quite abolish Works, which in other places he doth maintain and plead for, as without which we must not think to be saved: but he speaks in reference to Justification, and so he excludes Works even for this very reason, because they cannot justifie, except they be meritorious, and such as that the reward of them is of debt, and not of Grace, *viz.* pardoning Grace; for otherwise whatever reward the Creator doth bestow upon the Creature, it is of Grace. Yet it doth not therefore follow that Faith is meritorious, because we are justified by Faith. For Faith doth justifie Relatively, in respect of Christ's Righteousness, which it apprehendeth, and by which so apprehended we are justified: but so Works cannot justifie; they must either justifie for their own worth, or not at all, save only *Declarative*, by manifesting our Faith, and so our Justification. See Mr. *Ball* of the Coven. *c.* 3. *p.* 19. & *c.* 6. *p.* 69, 70.

Ubi (inquit) Sunt opera, illis debitum præmium expenditur quod datur fidei, gratuitum est. Calvin. *Instit. lib.* 3. *c.* 11. §. 18. *vide ibid. plura.*

1. The

1. The Scriptures do plainly ſo diſtinguiſh, as to deny Working, that thereby we may be juſtified, *Rom.* 3. 28. and 4. 5. Yet to aſſert, Working, that thereby we may be ſaved, *Phil.* 2. 12. You will ſay, That the former places ſpeak of Meritorious and Legal Working. 81.

But, 1. All Working which is good, is Legal, as I have ſhewed before, *i. e.* according to the Rule and Preſcript of the Law, even Goſpel-Obedience is in that reſpect Legal. And when the Apoſtle doth exclude the Deeds of the Law from Juſtification, he doth not mean (as ſome take it) Deeds done by the Power of the Law, without Grace, but Deeds which the Law doth preſcribe however done. For he denies that *Abraham* was juſtified by his Works; yet doubtleſs they were not done without Grace.

The Apoſtle taketh it as granted, That all Works whereby we are juſtified, are meritorious: for if there be no meritoriouſneſs in them, he ſuppoſeth there is no being juſtified by them. For indeed how can Working juſtifie, if there be any defect and failing in it? Therefore Faith it ſelf doth not juſtifie in reſpect of it ſelf, but in reſpect of Chriſt whom it apprehendeth. See *Calvin Inſt. lib.* 3 *cap.* 11. §. 7. the words were before-cited.

To your Second; I have always denied that there is the ſame reaſon of Salvation (*viz.* compleat) and Juſtification; and have always held, That Juſtification at Judgment is but a manifeſtation of our preſent Juſtification.

To your Third; None is *Reus Pœnæ*, except he be *Reus Culpæ*; and there is no *Reatus Culpæ*, but by tranſgreſſing the Law, though it may be aggravated, and ſo the other, by the Goſpel. But properly the not-fulfilling of the Condition of the Goſpel, taking it merely as a Condition, and not as a Duty, doth not bring a new Guilt, but only leaves a Man in the old Guilt, with an aggravation of it, he having no benefit of the Goſpel to free him from his Guilt, and being the more deeply guilty, in that he neglected the Mercy which he might have obtained.

Ibid. 1. Some of your words (I confeſs) I do not underſtand, nor can I ſee what reference they have to mine in the *Animadverſions*. But when you ſpeak of Right to Juſtification and Salvation, you ſeem to mean Sentential Juſtification at Judgment. For elſe we have here Juſtification it ſelf, and not only a right unto it, though we have only a right to Salvation, and not Salvation it ſelf; I mean in reſpect of the fulneſs and perfection of it. And though Juſtification and Salvation flow from the ſame Covenant, yet there is more required unto Salvation, than unto Juſtification by that Covenant: and ſo you alſo hold in reſpect of your firſt Juſtification.

2. You trouble your ſelf more than needs with your Diſtinctions, which (as you do uſe them) do but involve the Matter in more obſcurity. Surely my words of themſelves, [Freedom from all ſin in reſpect of imputation, and from all condemnation for ſin] are far more perſpicuous, than when you ſo multiply Diſtinctions to find out (forſooth) the meaning of them. For, 1. Is not [Freedom] more plain than [Liberation ?] though they both ſignifie the ſame thing. 2. Can there be an Active Liberation without a Paſſive, or a Paſſive without an Active ? If God free us, are we not freed ? And if we be freed, doth not God free us ? What need then to diſtinguiſh in that manner ? If freedom relate to God, it is Active; if to us, it is Paſſive. And what difference betwixt Liberation, or Freedom, (*viz.* from the Imputation of Sin, and Condemnation for Sin) and Abſolution ?

3. The Reprobate are *Condemnati per ſententiam Judicis*, Joh. 3. 18. *etiamſi ſententia publica prolatio, ejuſque plena executio in ultimum uſque diem ſit dilata.*

4. Not only right to Abſolution, but Abſolution it ſelf is perfect to a Believer through Chriſt, *Rom.* 8. 1. Neither are there any more Conditions of Juſtification at any time than Faith: though more ſins be every day committed, and ſo more are to be pardoned, yet ſtill Faith as well afterward as at firſt doth procure the pardon of them, without Works, as therein concurrent with it.

Non

Non aliam Justitiam (saith *Calvin*) *ad finem usque vitæ habent fideles, quàm quæ illic* (*nempe* Rom. 4. & 2 Cor. 5.) *describitur.* *Instit. l 3. c. 14. §. 11.*

5. Actual Absolution, and Judicial *per sententiam Judicis*, is in this life, and that perfect, though there be not a perfect declaration of it till the Last Judgment.

6. When you say, [*Condemnation is not perfect, if any at all, till the Last Judgment*], you do in effect question whether there be any Justification till then. For if no Condemnation, then no Justification. But Condemnation * (I say) is perfect here, though the Sentence be not publickly pronounced, and fully executed till hereafter.

* *I speak of the Reprobate, who neither do, nor ever shall believe.*

7. I do not speak of freedom from all sin as the Antinomians do, as if God did see no sin in his Children, and they had no sin to be humbled for: but I say, That God doth not impute sin unto them, so as to condemn them for it. And so much surely the Scripture doth say, if I understand it, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *Rom.* 8. 1. For freedom from future sins, I have said enough before.

8. The word [Justification] may be used *in sensu Judiciario*, (as I have shewed before) and yet Justification at Judgment be but a manifestation of our present Justification. Your Quotations out of the *Civilians* are not against me, for I say, *Sententia Judicis jam lata est, etiamsi in extremo demum die plenè publicèque sit revelanda.* I speak also of an Authoritative Manifestation; and therefore your Instance of a Woman manifesting a Felony, &c. is not to the purpose.

Obedience as a Fruit of Faith is necessary, both *necessitate præcepti*, so that it is sin to omit it; and also *necessitate medii*, so that we cannot be saved without it. But if it be a Means, (say you) then it is a Condition. Well, but a Means and a Condition (say I) of what? Of Salvation? It is granted. Of Justification? It is denied, neither doth this follow upon the other. 83

Taking Christ for Lord is virtually included in taking him for Priest; see *Rom.* 14. 9. and 2 *Cor.* 5. 15. They cannot be divided, though they be distinguished. That *Ibid.*

Faith which receiveth Christ as Priest, doth also receive him as Lord, either expresly, if Christ be propounded as Lord, or at least implicitly: yet Faith only, as receiving Christ as Priest, doth justifie, for the reason alledged before, to which I see nothing that you have said of force to refel it. Wicked Men cannot unfeignedly receive Christ as Priest, whiles they retain a Heart standing out in rebellion against Christ as Lord. Can they indeed embrace Christ as satisfying for them, and yet not yeeld up themselves in obedience unto him?

The Apostle (it seems) was of another mind; [*The love of Christ* (saith he) *constraineth us. For we thus judg, That if one died for all, then were all dead: And that he died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them, and rose again*]. 2 Cor. 5. 14, 15.

And again, [*I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live, I live by Faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me*], Gal. 2. 20.

This is the nature of that Faith which doth receive Christ as a Reconciler, to work through Love, *Gal.* 5. 6. May I not retort upon you, and say, When you have taught wicked Men, that Faith alone doth justifie at first, and they are willing to believe, will you perswade them that they are unjustified again, because Works do not follow after? For my part, I know no unjustifying of those who are once justified. You speak sometimes of being justified to day by Faith without Works, and of being unjustified to morrow, or the day after, except Works come in and help to justifie. But I say, Faith without a promptitude to Works doth not justifie at first; such as do not receive Christ as Lord, and do good Works, when there is opportunity, were never justified at all, they never had a true Justifying-Faith, which is never without Works, as the seasonable Fruits and Effects of it: Yet Faith both at first and last doth justifie without Works, as concurrent with it unto Justification. What you say of a willingness to receive Christ, is nothing. For I speak of a true actual receiving, which I say cannot be of Christ as Priest, except it be (either expresly or implicitly) of Christ as Lord also: and yet we are justified by receiving him

him in the one respect, and not in the other. None can have that Faith which justifieth, but they shall have also other Graces and VVorks of Obedience in their season; Yet do not other Graces therefore, or VVorks justifie as well as Faith.

Bellarmine objecting; *Fides vera potest reperiri à dilectione separari.* — *Contra Bellar.*

Amesius answers; *Aliqua fides potest; talis est Pontificia: sed illa fides, cui nos tribuimus justificandi virtutem, cum unionem faciat nostri cum Christo, à Christi Spiritu vivificante, & Sanctificante non potest separari.* — *Tom. 4. lib. 5. c. 4. ad 8.*

Yet he saith; *Fides non justificat, ut respicit præcepta operum faciendorum, sed solummodò ut respicit promissionem gratiæ.* — *Ibid. cap. 3. §. 6.*

So Dr. *Prideaux*; *Fides sola justificat, non ratione existentiæ, absque spe & charitate, sed muneris. Lect. 5. de Justif. §. 7.*

And Mr. *Ball* of the Coven. *c. 6. p. 73.* [Abraham *was justified by Faith alone; but this Faith, though alone in the Act of Justification, no other Grace co-working with it, was not alone in existence, did not lie dead in him, as a dormant and idle quality.* —— * *Works then (or a purpose to walk with God) justifie as the passive qualification of the Subject, capable of Justification, or as the qualification of that Faith which justifieth; or as they testifie or give proof that Faith is lively: but Faith alone justifieth, as it embraceth the promise of free forgiveness in Jesus Christ*].

* *Those words you alledg afterwards, but they are little to your purpose.*

Here by the way observe how *Amesius* and Mr. *Ball* speak of Faith apprehending and embracing the Promise; which manner of speech may also be observed in other eminent Divines, yet you somewhere censure Mr. *Cotton* somewhat sharply for speaking in that manner.

1. If it be as difficult for the Understanding to believe, (*i. e.* assent unto) Christ's Priestly Office, as is his Kingly, then it seems also as hard for the VVill to consent to, or accept of the one as the other. If the VVill be inclined to a thing, it will move the Understanding to assent unto it. *Quod valde volumus, facilè credimus.* That the Jews believed neither Christ's Kingly nor his — *Ibid. & 84.*

Prieſtly Office, was the perverſneſs of their Will, as well as the error of their Underſtanding. What the Papiſts, with whom you have met, do ſay, matters little; we ſee what their great Rabbies ſay and maintain in their Diſputations. Yet it is no ſtrange thing, if even they alſo now and then let fall ſomething, wherein they give teſtimony to the Truth, though in the whole current of their Diſcourſes they oppoſe it.

Contra Bellar. Tom. 4. lib 6. c. 1. ad 22. *Ameſius* ſheweth, That *Bellarmine* in that very place which you cite, doth contradict himſelf, whiles he is overearneſt to contradict Proteſtants; *Bellarminus hic implicat ſeipſum contradictione, ut nobis poſſit contradicere.*

Whereas you cite *River* diſclaiming that which *Bellarmine* maketh to be the Opinion of Proteſtants, *viz.* That Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is the formal Cauſe of Juſtification, I have ſaid enough about it before, *viz.* That ſome underſtanding the Term one way, ſome another, our Divines expreſs themſelves variouſly; yet all agree in the thing it ſelf, *viz.* That Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, through Faith imputed unto us, is that by which we are juſtified; See *Davenant de Juſtit. Habit. cap.* 24. *ad* 5. where he anſwers this very Argument of *Bellarmine*, though he contract his words, and leave out thoſe which you cite; but however, both there, and in other places which I cited before, he hath enough to this purpoſe, concerning the formal Cauſe of Juſtification, and how the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us may be ſo termed.

Lect. 5. De Juſtif. §. 11. Dr. *Prideaux* alſo (I ſee) is offended at *Bellarmine* for ſaying, *Sed ita imputari nobis Chriſti juſtitiam, ut per eam formaliter juſti nominemur, & ſimus, id nos cum recta ratione pugnare contendimus*; as if this were the Opinion of Proteſtants.

At quis unquam è noſtris (ſaith the Doctor) *nos per juſtitiam Chriſti imputatam, formaliter juſtificari aſſeruit?*

But ſee how and in what ſenſe he doth diſclaim that Opinion; *Annon formam quamlibet inhærentem, quâ formaliter juſti denominemur, ſemper exploſimus?*

In this ſenſe alſo *Davenant* doth reject it; *Quod dicit* Bellarminus, *impoſſibile eſſe, ut, per juſtitiam Chriſti imputatam formaliter juſti ſimus, ſi per formaliter intelligat*

telligat inhærenter, nugas agit, atque tribuit illam ipsam sententiam Protestantibus, quam oppugnant. De Justit. Habit. cap. 24. ad 5. Yet in another sense he holds that Christ's Righteousness imputed to us, is the formal Cause of our Justification; the words were before cited.

And as others, so Dr. *Prideaux* speaks the very same thing, saying, *Justificamur per justitiam Christi, non personæ, quâ ipse est vestitus, sed meriti, quâ suos vestit, nobis imputatam.* *Ubi supra.*

But for the principal thing intended in this Section of yours, Though wicked Men may be more ready to receive Christ as their Justifier, than as their Ruler, (so you express it); yet it follows not, that the receiving of Christ as a Ruler, is that Act of Faith which doth justifie. For the difficulty of a thing is no good Argument to prove the necessity of it, either at all, or to such a purpose.

2. My second Note was to this purpose, quite to take away the force of your Argument, and so (I think) it doth notwithstanding your Reply. For have we not God's means to overcome that averseness of nature, if the receiving of Christ as Lord do necessarily follow Pardon, as well as if it be a Condition of Pardon? When I make it a Fruit of Justifying-Faith to take Christ for Lord, I do not say but that Christ may at once be received both as Priest and as Lord, and so must, if he be so propounded; I speak of express propounding and receiving: But my meaning is, That though we be justified by receiving Christ as Priest, perhaps not yet hearing of him (expressly) as Lord, yet that Justifying-Faith will also put forth it self to take Christ for Lord, when he is so set forth unto us. To be justified before we take Christ as Lord, is not to be justified before we take Christ as Christ. For Christ is Christ as Priest, though not only as Priest. Indeed to receive Christ in respect of one Office, so as to refuse him in respect of another, were not to receive Christ as Christ: but that is not the Case as I do put it. And for the moral necessity of taking Christ as Lord, which you ask what it is, if it be not a Condition: I suppose it may be morally necessary as a thing commanded, and yet be no Condition of Justification. For

can nothing be commanded, and so be morally necessary, but it must be commanded and be necessary to that end, that thereby we may be justified? Works are commanded, and so necessary, yet you hold them to be no Condition of our Justification at first, neither indeed are they afterward, as that of *Gen.* 15. 6. with *Rom.* 4. 2, 3. doth irrefragably prove.

Your Argument I thus retort, [He that is justified, is in a State of Salvation, and should be saved, if he so died. But he that hath Faith without VVorks, is justified; *Ergo*, he is in a State of Salvation, and if he so die, shall be saved]. Answer for your self as you please: for my part I say, The same Faith which receiveth Christ as Priest, and so justifieth, is ready also to receive Christ as Lord, when he is so propounded; even as that Faith, which justifieth, is ready to produce Works, when they are required.

84. 1. You should not only suppose, but prove, that the excluding of Obedience from Justification (as co-partner with Faith in justifying) is a Scandal given, and an Error.

2. If it were not *Paul*'s design to advance Faith above Love, *&c.* in point of Justification, what then means his so frequent asserting Faith to be that whereby we are justified, and his never-mentioning Love, *&c.* to that purpose?

3. Your self acknowledg an aptitude in Faith to justifie as apprehending Christ, and I acknowledg, that besides this God hath appointed Faith for that purpose, in respect of its aptitude, making choice of it rather than of any other Grace.

Ibid. I have also oft enough considered what you have said.

Justificatio (faith *Davenant*) *purgat, & absuit à reatu & pœnâ peccati, idque uno momento, & perfectè. De Justit. Habit. cap.* 23. *ad Arg.* 4.

Though Justification be perfect, as freeing from all Condemnation; yet so long as there may be Accusation, there is need of Justification. Whereas you speak of the Law justifying, *&c. It is God that justifieth*, Rom. 8. 33. though according to the Gospel or New-Covenant,

(for

(for that, I presume, you mean by the Law) and by the imputation of Christ's Righteousness. Christ as our Advocate doth plead our Cause, and procure our Justification; and at the Last Judgment, as God's Vicegerent, he will publickly pronounce Sentence.

I see nothing against me, but that still you run upon this Supposition, That there is the same Condition of Salvation, and of Justification at Judgment, whereas I suppose that VVorks are a Condition of Salvation, as full and compleat, but not so of Justification at Judgment, that being but a manifestation of our present Justification, and so VVorks looked at but as Fruits and Evidences of Faith, whereby we are justified. If *Illyricus* his Doctrine were the same with this, his fellow-Protestants (I dare say) would not blame him for it. Neither do I see how *Illyricus* could, or any rational Man can grant VVorks to be necessary Fruits of Faith, and yet deny them to be means or Conditions of Salvation, in respect of the actual and full enjoyment of it. For surely as Faith it self is required that we may be justified, so the Fruits of Faith (to be produced in due season) are required that we may be glorified. But why do you thus still jumble together Justification and Salvation, saying, [Illyricus *his Error was in denying Works to be necessary to Justification and Salvation* ?] Yet when you cite *Bucer* and *Melancthon* as asserting the necessity of good VVorks, there is not a syllable in them about Justification, as if VVorks were necessary in that respect. *Ibid.* & 85.

Bucer in that Conference at *Ratisbon*, which you cite, though he maintain Inherent Righteousness, (as who doth not?) yet he saith, *Hâc justitiâ nemo justificatur coram Deo justificatione vitæ*, as he is cited by *Lud. de Dieu* in *Rom.* 8. 4. *ubi plura vide.*

So *Melancthon* is cited by *Bellarmine* as holding with other Protestants of prime note, that, *Sola fides justificat, & tamen fides quæ justificat, non est sola.* *De Justif. lib.* 1. *c.* 14.

And *Wotton* saith, (*De Reconcil. Part* 2. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. *Num.* 4.) Lutherus, Melancthon, Calvinus, Chemnitius, *ea potissimum causâ nos infisâ & inhærente justitiâ justificari non posse contendunt, quòd illa in nobis ita imperfecta sit, ut in Dei conspectum, quum ad judicandum*

eandum accedat, prodire non audeat. But of *Bucer* and *Melanchthon* more by and by.

For *Illyricus*, what in other places he may hold I cannot tell, but in the Centuries (whereof he was the chief Author) he seems to agree with other prime Protestants; For he brings in 27 Arguments, whereby the Apostles (he saith) prove, *Hominem solâ fide absque operibus Legis justificari*; Among which the 23d is this; *Duæ sunt tantum viæ ad salutem, & nulla est tertia, &c. Una harum est per opera Legis; altera est per fidem in Christum, qui pro nobis Legem implevit. Sed illa, quæ est per opera Legis, postulat à nobis integerrimam impletionem, quam quia nemo potest præstare, omnes damnantur à Lege. Ea verò quæ per fidem est, gratis propter opera Christi, donat justitiam & vitam credentibus. Qui ergò vult per opera salvari propria, is alteram viam tollit; & è contrà, qui vult per fidem salvari gratis, is non potest per opera sua justificari. Gal.* 5. (perhaps it should be *Gal.* 3.) *Rom.* 4. & 10. *Ephes.* 2.

Cent. 1. *lib.* 2. *c.* 4. *Col.* 253, *&c.*

Here he seems indeed to confound Justification and Salvation, as if there were the same reason of both, and Works were no more required unto Salvation than unto Justification. But surely by Salvation he meant a Right unto Salvation, which doth necessarily go along with Justification; and whatsoever it be that doth justifie, the same also doth give a right unto Salvation. For otherwise he makes Works and new Obedience necessary to the full enjoyment of Salvation.

For he treats at large *de novâ obedientiâ seu bonis operibus justificatorum*; and he goes through the several Commandments, and brings in a Catalogue of Good Works which are required in every Commandment.

Ibid. Col. 279, *&c.* *Ibid. Col.* 283, *&c.*

Though he sometimes only expresseth these Reasons, why new Obedience and good Works must be performed, *ut glorificetur Deus, & inserviatur proximo, & sint testimonia veræ fidei*; yet even these reasons do imply that new Obedience and good Works are necessary unto Salvation, *viz.* in that sense as I have explained. For can any think to be saved, except they have a care to glorifie God, to serve their Neighbour, and to give testimony of their Faith?

Ibid. Col. 279.

But

But sometimes he speaks more expresly to this purpose, saying, *Iis qui fidæ gratis acceperunt remissionem peccatorum, Apostoli etiam de novitate vitæ concionantur, & pœnas comminantur rursès sese peccatis sine pœnitentiâ polluentibus.* *Ibid. Col. 349, &c.*

And among other places he alledgeth that *Phil. 2. Cum timore & tremore vestram ipsorum salutem operamini.*

And among other reasons, Why all must repent and walk in newness of Life, he brings in this as the sixth; *Subitus extremi judicii adventus*; And cites that 1 *Joh. 2. Manete in eo, ut cum apparuerit, fiduciam habeamus, & non pudefiamus in adventu ejus:* And that 1 *Thess. 5. Ipsi planè scitis, quòd dies ille Domini, ut fur in nocte, ita venturus sit: Cum enim dixerint, Pax & tuta omnia, tunc repentinus eis ingruet interitus, sicut dolor partus multeri prægnanti, &c. Proinde ne dormiamus, &c.*

And for the next reason he brings in this; *Pœna æternæ impœnitentium*, citing Rom. 2. *Juxtà duritiam tuam, & cor pœnitere nescium, colligis tibi ipsi iram in die iræ, quo patefiet justum judicium Dei, &c. Ventura est indignatio, ira, afflictio, & anxietas adversus omnem animam hominis perpetrantis malum, &c.*

This (I think) is sufficient to shew that *Illyricus* (at least when he helped to write the Centuries) was as much for Obedience and good Works as either *Bucer* or *Melancthon*, for any thing that I see you cite out of them, and that he made them so Fruits of Faith, whereby we are justified, and have right to Salvation, that withal he made them Means or Conditions of Glorification; and more than this the words of *Bucer* and *Melancthon* do not import.

Whereas you say, that *Davenant*'s words, which I cited, have nothing that you dislike, save only that Grace is said to be infused *in ipso actu justificandi*, which yet you shew how it is not to be disliked; you consider not for what end I cited those words, *viz.* To shew that all Protestants generally acknowledg and profess, (so he, *Omnes enim agnoscimus, & clarè profitemur*) that Inherent Righteousness doth go along with Imputed Righteousness, though it be this and not that by which we are justified; and consequently, That Works are necessary

ry as Fruits of Faith, and Means of Salvation, though yet Works have no Copartnership with Faith in justifying.

Neither *Bucer* nor *Melancthon*, nor any of our famous Divines that I know, did teach other Doctrine. And because you seem to carry it so as if *Melancthon* and *Bucer* had been of your Opinion; though what I have said already may suffice to shew the contrary, yet I will add a little more.

Tom. 1. loc. de bonis Oper. *Melancthon* saith; *Planè & clarè dico, Obedientia nostra, hoc est, justitia bona conscientiæ seu operum, qua Deus nobis percepit, necessariò sequi reconciliationem debet.*

But here he saith no more for Works than generally Protestants do; he is far from making them concurrent with Faith unto Justification.

Ibid. de Vocab. Fid. Again; *Sed nos (inquit) sciamus suum locum esse justitiæ operum, longè verò aliâ consolatione opus esse in quærendâ reconciliatione.*

Ibid. And again; *Cum dicitur, fide justificamur, non aliud dicetur, quàm quòd propter Filium Dei accipimus remissionem peccatorum, & reputamur justi. Et quia oportet apprehendi hoc beneficium dicitur fide, i. e. fiduciâ misericordiæ promissæ propter Christum. Intelligatur ergo propositio correlativè, Fide sumus justi, i. e. per misericordiam propter Filium Dei sumus justi seu accepti.*

Tom. 2. de Eccles. p. 133. And he alledgeth *Basil*, saying; *Sine ullâ sophisticâ detrahit justificationem bonis operibus; nec loquitur de ceremonialibus, sed de omnibus virtutibus; nec tantùm loquitur de operibus ante renovationem, sed de virtutibus in renovatis, ac jubet sentire, quòd solâ fiduciâ misericordiæ propter Christum promissæ justi sumus. —— Hæc est (inquit* Basilius*) perfecta & integra gloriatio in Deo, quando ne quidem propter justitiam suam aliquis effertur, sed agnoscit sibi deesse veram justitiam, fide autem solâ in Christum justificari, &c.*

In Præfat. Enerrat. Epistolæ ad Rom. *Bucer* also commends *Melancthon* for saying; *Sola fide justificamur, solius misericordiæ fiduciâ justi pronuntiamur.*

And presently he adds; *Nemini siquidem pio dubium esse potest, quin per solam Dei misericordiam, propterque*

que unius Christi meritum, ac nullâ omninò nostra quamlibet sancta opera, & germanissimos Spiritus fructus, nos justificemur, hoc est, à Deo justi pronuntiemur.

1. I am sorry to see you so bent to maintain what you have once done. Is it fair to take hold on a few words of an Author, and to pass by that which immediately followeth, and shew that he meant quite contrary to what is pretended? Is not this to make your self guilty of that which you accuse others of, *viz.* to take up some scraps against the meaning of the whole Book, and even the very Page out of which you take them? 85.

2. I think nothing is more clear, than that Mr. *Ball's* words following those which you cited, gainsay your Opinion, *viz.* of Works concurring with Faith unto Justification. For he expresly saith, That Faith alone justifieth, and that Works do but testifie and give proof, that Faith is lively.

Is not this the very thing that I so much contend for? And yet you stick not to say, That he yeeldeth Faith and Works to be the Condition of Justification, as if they were Copartners in this respect, whereas he ascribeth Justification wholly to Faith, and excludeth Works from having any concurrence with it in justifying. A little before the place by you cited, he opposeth those who make Faith and Works the Condition, without which Remission cannot be obtained, and saith it is impossible to conceive how Faith and Works should be conjoyned as Con-causes in Justification, seeing Faith attributes all to Free-Grace, and Works challenge to themselves. And a little before that again he saith, [*We read of two ways of Justification, by Faith, and by Works, but of a third manner, by Faith and Works both, as joint Causes, or Con-causes, we find nothing in Scripture*]. As he makes Faith to be more than a bare Condition, if by [Condition] be meant only *Causa sine quâ non*, so do I: yet he doth use the words [Condition] and [Instrument] promiscuously, and doth sometimes call Faith the one way, sometimes the other. He supposeth also, That if Works concur with Faith unto Justification, they are Con-causes, and not such Conditions as are only *Causa sine quibus non*, as you seem to take it. Of the Coven. p. 70. *Ibid.* p. 69.

3. You say that you allow of the Explicatory terms, as I judg them. Why? then you allow of this, [Faith alone

alone doth justifie]; yea, [as it embraceth the promise of free forgiveness in Jesus Christ]; for so immediately Mr. *Ball* doth explain himself. And for this very reason he denies Works to justifie, because [*Works do not embrace Christ*]: Your distinction of Inchoated and Continued Justification, will here stand you in no stead. For besides that Mr. *Ball* speaks of Justification simply considered, it's certain that Works neither at first nor afterward concur with Faith in embracing the promise of free-forgiveness in Jesus Christ: and therefore if Faith justifie in this respect, (as Mr. *Ball* saith it * doth, and you seem to give your approbation of what he saith) surely both at first and afterward Faith alone doth justifie: though Works appear in their season, yet they do not concur with Faith unto Justification.

Of the Coven. p. 70.

* *And* p. 71. *he proves it, because in Scripture every where Faith in Christ, in the Lord Jesus, or the Blood of Christ, is said to justifie, not Faith in other Promises, Threatnings, or Commandments.*

4. That which you cite out of Mr. *Ball*, p. 20. doth not reach home to your purpose. To say, as he there doth, [*A disposition to good Works is necessary to Justification*], is no more than to say, A lively and working Faith, or a Faith apt and ready to Work, is necessary unto Justification. So when he saith, [*Good Works of all sorts are necessary to our continuance in the state of Justification, and so to our final absolution, if God give opportunity*]; he meaneth only this, that Works are necessary Fruits of that Faith by which we lay hold on the Righteousness of Christ, and so are justified and absolved. [*The Faith that is lively* (saith he) *to embrace Mercy, is ever conjoyned with an unfeigned purpose to walk in all well-pleasing, and the sincere performance of all holy Obedience, as opportunity is offered, doth ever attend that Faith whereby we continually* (*N. B.*) *lay hold on the Promises once embraced. Actual good Works of all sorts* (*though not perfect in degree*) *are necessary to the continuance of Actual Justification, because Faith can no longer lay claim to the Promises of Life, than it doth virtually or actually lead us forward in the way to Heaven*]. It is clear, that as well afterward as at first, he ascribes Justification only to Faith, as being only that which doth embrace the Promises, though he require a working Disposition at first, and Works themselves afterward

Of the Coven. p. 21.

ward, as opportunity ſerveth, to teſtifie and give proof that Faith is lively, * as he expreſly ſpeaketh. The words which you further add, I have cited before, and they are directly againſt you, ſhewing that as I and others take the word [Condition] Faith is the only Condition of Juſtification, and Works no part of it. And ſee what Mr. *Ball* addeth immediately after thoſe words, [*Faith and Works are oppoſed in the Matter of Juſtification, not that they cannot ſtand together in the ſame Subject, for they be inſeparably united, but becauſe they cannot concur or meet together in one and the ſame Court, to the Juſtification or Abſolution of Man*]. That which you cite from *p.* 21. is not to be underſtood (as you ſeem to take it) of actual walking, but of a diſpoſition to walk, as he ſaid *p.* 20. [*A diſpoſition to Works*, &c.] This diſpoſition is the qualification of that Faith, or always conjoined with that Faith, whereby we are partakers of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs. This plainly appears to be his meaning, both by the words immediately going before, and alſo by the words in the preceding Page, both which are already cited.

* Of the Coven. p. 73.

1. If Perſonal Righteouſneſs be not perfect, but have need of pardon for the imperfection of it, then there is no being juſtified by it. This very reaſon *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, *Calvin*, and *Chemnitius* give, why we cannot be juſtified by Inherent Righteouſneſs, as I noted before out of *Wotton de Recon. part* 2. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 19. *num.* 4. And to this purpoſe I alſo have cited before the words of *Calvin*, *Davenant*, *Ameſius*, *Rivet* and *Maccovius*. As for the Metaphyſical Perfection of Being, which you ſpeak of, it is but ſuch as doth belong to things that are moſt imperfect. And for *Præſtatio Conditionis N. Legis*, it is not (as I have ſaid before) properly that Righteouſneſs by which we are juſtified, though it be required to that end, that we may be partakers of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and ſo (*viz.* by that Righteouſneſs of Chriſt) be juſtified. 2. Of Juſtification *quàm continuationem, & Sententiam Judicis* (*nempe in ultimo Judicio*) enough hath been ſaid before. Neither *Calvin*, nor any of our famous Divines, (that I know) nor yet the Scriptures (ſo far as I can find) do teach, that we are juſtified by Faith alone at firſt, but by Faith and Works afterward; yea I have ſhewed the contrary both from the Scriptures, and from our Divines; yet they both teach, That Faith whereby we are (both at firſt *Ibid.*

first and afterward) justified, hath in it at first a readiness to Works; and afterward doth work, as opportunity is offered. *Quid commerita est Fides (inquit* Maccovius) *in progressu vitæ, ut tantum non possit, quantum in initio? Ergone ingenium fides mutaverit, &c. De Justif. Disp.* 10. See *Calvin Instit. lib.* 3. *cap.*14. §.11. and *Rivet* in *Gen.*15. *Exercit.* 83. *pag.* 404. *Col.*1. Whereas you say that *Calvin* maintaineth a true Personal Righteousness; What is that to the purpose? Who doth not so? If that were all that you bade see *Calvin* for, truly you might soon cite Authors good store: but (as *Martial* speaks) *Dic aliquid de tribus capellis.* Shew that either *Calvin*, or any Judicious Orthodox Divine doth hold such a Personal Righteousness, as whereby we are justified: both *Calvin* and all our eminent and approved VVriters (that I know) deny this Personal Righteousness to be available unto Justification. Yea, and so do some of chief account in the Church of *Rome*. *Contarenus*, a Cardinal, to this purpose you may find cited by *Amesius contra Bellar. Tom.*4. *lib.*3. *cap.*1. *Thes.*1. *Pighius* also, a great Romish Champion, is as clear and full for this as may be. *In illo (inquit* sc. *Christo) justificamur, non in nobis; non nostrâ, sed illius justitiâ, quæ nobis cum illo communicantibus imputatur. Propriæ justitiæ inopes, extranos in illo docemur justitiam quærere.* Much more he hath to the same purpose, and herein doth so fully agree with Protestants (though about Faith, as being that alone whereby the Righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, he dissents from them); that *Bellarmine* having recited the Opinion of Protestants, saith, (*De Justif. lib.*2. *cap.*1.) *In eandem sententiam, sive potius errorem incidit Albertus Pighius*; he adds also, *Et Authores Antididagmatis Colonienses.* And for *Pighius* he saith further, *Bucerus in libro Concordiæ in articulo de Justificatione, fatetur Pighii sententiam non dissentire à Lutheranorum sententiâ, quod attinet ad causam formalem Justificationis, sed solùm quantum ad causam apprehensivum, quam Lutherani solam fidem, Pighius dilectionem potius quam fidem esse definit.* Here by the way observe, That *Bucer* (if *Bellarmine* did truly relate his Opinion, though not his only) made Christ's Righteousness imputed to us, the formal Cause of Justification, and Faith the only apprehensive Cause: and that therefore he was far from making us to be justified by our Personal Righteousness, & from making Works concurrent with Faith unto Justification; but that otherwise is evident enough by what hath been cited before out of him. The truth of my Conclusion (I think I may well conclude) is firm and clear, *viz.* That according to *Calvin* (and so *Bucer* and all our famous Writers) Personal Righteousness is not that whereby we are justified. What colour you can have to except

De Fide & Just.

except against this Conclusion, to say it is merely my own, is to me a wonder.

Ibid. Repentance and Love to Christ are not excluded from our first Justification, yet have they no co-interest with Faith in Justifying; Faith, not Repentance, or Love being *Causa apprehensiva* (as *Bucer* and other Protestants do speak) that which doth apprehend Christ's Righteousness, by which so apprehended we are justified. Neither is it denied, that outward Works are requisite, that we may continue justified here, and be sententially (solemnly and openly) justified at the last Judgment: yet it follows not that Justification as continued and consummated at Judgment, is by Works, as concurring with Faith unto Justification. It is the Righteousness of Christ apprehended by Faith, by which we are justified from first to last, only this Faith being of a working Nature, we cannot continue justified, nor shall be (*i. e.* declared to be) justified at the last Judgment, except we have Works to testifie and give proof that our Faith is lively, as Mr. *Ball* before cited doth express it: but thus also it will follow, that Works being wholly wanting, we never had a Justifying Faith, nor were at all justified.

86. 1. That the Qualification of Faith is part of the Condition of Justification, so that Faith alone, as apprehending Christ and his Righteousness, is not the Condition (or Instrumental Cause, for I do not take Condition for *Causa sine quâ non*, but for that which hath some causality in it) you have not proved. The Condition of our Justification is that we believe in the Lord Jesus Christ; this presupposeth a desire of him, and inferreth a delight in him, and submission to him; yet it is only believing in him, by which we are justified. 2. Though the taking of Christ for King be as Essential to that Faith which justifieth, as the taking of him for Priest, yet not to Faith as it justifieth. Of *Fides quæ*, and *Fides quâ justificat*, as also of taking Christ for King, and taking him for Priest, I have said enough before. 3. I mean that Faith only justifieth, as it receives Christ as Priest, tho that Faith which justifieth doth receive Christ as King also. 4. If it be (as you grant) Christ's Satisfaction, and not his Kingship (or Sovereignty) which justifieth meritoriously, then (as far as I am able to judg) it is our apprehending of Christ's Satisfaction, and not our submitting to his Sovereignty, by which we are justified. The Act of Justifying Faith, as Justifying (me-thinks) can extend no further than to that Office of Christ, in respect of which he justifieth; or than as Christ is our Righteousness, by which we are justified; Christ as Advocate doth only justifie by pleading his Satisfaction for us, and our interest in it, and as Judg, by declaring us to be justified by it: and all this *secundum fœdus novum*, which is the ground of our Justifi-

cation. 5. I so confess Faith to be the Condition of Justification, that nevertheless I hold it to justifie as apprehending Christ's Righteousness, God having in that respect required Faith of us, that we may be justified. And herein (as I have shewed before) I have Mr. *Ball* and other Judicious Divines agreeing with me, who call Faith a Condition of Justification, and yet make it to justifie as it apprehendeth Christ and his Righteousness.

Ibid. My words clearly shew my meaning, *viz.* That Justification as it is begun by Faith alone, so it is continued, so that Obedience hath no more influence into our Justification afterward than at first. Justifying Faith at first is Obedential, *i. e.* ready to bring forth the Fruit of Obedience: and afterward, as there is opportunity, it doth actually bring forth the same; yet both at first, and afterward it is Faith and not Obedience by which we are justified.

Ibid. 1. I have also oft enough told you, that you bring nothing of any force to prove Sentential Justification at Judgment a distinct kind of Justification, or any more than a declaration and manifestation of our present Justification. 2. For the Texts which you alledged, you do not answer what I objected. You alledged them to prove, That we are justified compleatly and finally at the Last Judgment, by perseverance in faithful Obedience. I objected, That they speak of Justification, as it is here obtained, and so make not for your purpose; to this you say just nothing, only you seem to say something to those words in the end of the *Animadversion*, [*They shew who are justified, not by what they are justified*]; but that which you say, is of small force. For none can truly say as much of the Texts alledged for Faith's Justifying, seeing that those Texts expresly say, That we are justified by Faith, and that Faith is imputed unto us for Righteousness, which the other Texts do not say of Obedience.

Ibid. 1. Did you never understand my meaning about Faith's justifying until now? Nay, you seem not yet to understand it. Doth not Faith justifie at all, if it only justifies Instrumentally and Relatively? Is this so strange unto you, that when we are said to be justified by Faith, it is meant in respect of the Object, *viz.* Christ and his Righteousness, which is indeed that by which we are justified, though it must be apprehended by Faith, that we may be justified by it? Where is now the *totus mundus Theologorum Reformatorum*, which sometime you spake of? My acquaintance in this kind is not so great (I think) as yours, yet I have before alledged many to this purpose. I will here add one more, a Man of note, Dr. *Prideaux*, (*Lect. 5. de Justif.* §. 11, 14, 16.) *Justificamur (inquit) per justitiam Christi, &c. atque Fides ex parte nostrâ hanc justitiam sic a Deo imputatam, apprehendit solum modo & applicat; quia neque Charitati, vel Spei, vel*

alteri

alters habitui hoc munus competat. And again, *Justificat primò Deus Pater admittendo, & imputando.* 2. *Deus Filius, Satisfaciendo, & advocatum agendo.* 3. *Spiritus Sanctus revelando & obsignando.* 4. *Fides apprehendendo & applicando.* 5 *Opera, manifestando & declarando.* And again, *Animà evertere totum Bertius, nos non propriè justificationem fidei attribuere, sed metalepticè, quatenus objecti actus propter arctam connexionem inter illum & habitum, usitatâ Scripturæ phrasi, in habitum transfertur.* 2. For Christ's Righteousness justifying formally, or being the formal cause of Justification, I have shewed in what sense some of our Divines do hold it, and some reject it, and that the difference is rather in words, than in the thing it self. 3. To me it seems no obscurity to say, [Faith or Believing doth justifie, because Christ's Righteousness, except it be apprehended by Faith, is not available to Justification]. Is not this as much as Faith doth justifie Instrumentally, or as apprehending Christs Righteousness by which we are justified? The reason why Christ's Righteousness cannot justifie, except it be apprehended by Faith, is this, That God doth require Faith of us; Faith (I say) apprehending Christ and his Righteousness, [*Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ*] that so we may be justified. God's Will is properly the Cause, yet there is a congruity in the thing it self, an aptitude (you grant) in the nature of Faith: it is of an apprehensive Nature, and its apprehending of Christ's Righteousness (the Will of God still presupposed) doth make this Righteousness ours, even as a Gift becomes ours by our receiving of it. If *Davenant*'s words, which I cited, be not against you, then nothing that I can say is against you. For I cannot express my own mind, as to that point, more clearly and fully than he doth. I will repeat his words again; (*De Justit. Habit. cap.* 28.) *Nihil usitatius quàm causæ applicanti illud tribuere, quod propriè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam. Quia igitur fides apprehendit, & applicat nobis justitiam Christi, id fidei ipsi tribuitur, quod reapse Christo debetur.* Is not this against you, who say, *Append.* p. 120. [*Faith is a Work and Act of ours; and if Faith justifie as an apprehension of Christ, it justifieth as a Work?*] Do not these words of *Davenant* tell you, that it is not *Causa applicans*, but *res applicata*; not *Fides*, but *Christus fide apprehensus* that doth justifie? Faith then is said to justifie, yet not in respect of it self, but in respect of its Object: it is not properly Faith apprehending, or the apprehension of Faith, but Christ and his Righteousness apprehended, by which we are justified. Much hath been said before to this purpose. If this be nothing against you, I know not how in this particular to say any thing against you: if it be against you, surely it is nothing but what that Reverend Author saith in the words cited. And mark (I pray) upon what occasion

he brings in those words. *Bellarmine* (*De Justif. lib.2. cap.9.*) saith that *Calvin*, from *Rom.4. Ubi dicitur fidem Abrahæ imputatam esse ad justitiam*, gathers, *nihil esse aliud nostram justitiam* (*nempe quâ justificamur*) *quàm fidem in Christum, id est*, (*N.B.*) *Christi justitiam Christi fide apprehensam.* Against this he objects, *Apostolus dicit ipsam fidem imputari ad justitiam: fides autem non est justitia Christi, &c.* To this *Davenant* answers, *Sed frivola est hæc objectio. Nam nihil usitatius quàm causæ aplicanti, &c.* Your Objection is the very same in effect with *Bellarmine's*; so that if *Davenants* words be any thing against *Bellarmine*, they are as much against you. And truly as you put off the words of *Davenant*, so you might with the same ease have answered all my *Animadversions*, and so you may all these Exceptions, by saying, That they are not against you. It is a strange faculty that you seem to have, of making any thing for you, as when you bid see *Calvin* on *Luk.* 1. 6. and nothing against you, as here in this place.

Ibid. When Mr. *Manton* speaketh of Faith Justifying as a Relative Act, his words immediately before (which I also cited) shew his meaning, *viz.* That Faith justifieth in its relation to Christ, as it receiveth Christ: so that not every Act relating unto Christ, but that which doth so relate unto him as to receive him, is that which justifieth: but what I say of the Act justifying, must always be understood in the sense before explained. That Faith in respect of its apprehensive nature, is more than *Causa sine quâ non*, to me is clear; it is *Causa applicans*, as *Davenant* in the words even now cited doth call it. 2. To contend much about Faith's Instrumentality, I do not like; I mean in respect of the word [*Instrumentality*], so that we agree in the matter; yet as our best Divines have used the word, I see not but it is convenient to be used. 3. I grant it is a material question, Whether it be the receiving of Christ only as Priest that doth justifie; for the confounding of Christ's Offices, and of the Acts of Faith (as Mr. *Blake* before cited saith well) is not to be endured. But I see no necessary dependance of this question upon the other, *viz.* Whether Faith justifie as an Instrument, a sole-working Instrument, or as an Ordinance, or Relative Action required on our parts; which Mr. *Manton* said is all to the same issue and purpose, and so I think it is.

87. For the distinction of God's Will, you might at first apprehend what I meant, though perhaps my Expressions were not altogether so clear as afterward; neither indeed do you seem to speak so clearly of it in your *Aphorisms*. 2. How pertinent those Testimonies which you speak of are, I cannot tell; but truly as you cited *Calvin* on *Luk.* 1. 6. it is no hard matter to cite many. 3. What you alledg out of *Dave-*

nant,

nant, I might evade, by saying as you did, That it is not against me; but I will not put you off so. I answer therefore, *Ad* 1. [*Bona opera sunt necessaria omnibus fidelibus, & justificatis, qui habent usum rationis, & per ætatem operari possunt*]. *Ita sanè res habet: quis negat? Sed num ideò bonis operibus æquè ac fide justificamur? Adverte, quæso ipsa authoris tui verba.* [*Bona opera sunt necessaria justificatis*], *non justificandis. Nam* (*ut scitè* Augustinus) [*Bona opera sequuntur justificatum, non præcedunt justificandum. Quid quod tuipse fateris, nos fide absque operibus in initio justificari? Ita, inquies, sed posteà ut justificati simus, opera etiam à nobis requiruntur.* *At* Davenantius *istud non dicit, non iis certè verbis quæ citasti. Jubes autem legere sequentia; lego igitur,* [*Facile est hujusmodi opera multa* (*præsertim interna*) *commemorare sine quibus justificatio nunquam fuit ab ullo mortalium obtenta, nunquam obtinebitur*]. *Sed ne hîc quidem dicit opera ista pariter ac fidem justificari. Ea enim, quæ ad justificationem requiruntur, cum iis quæ justificant, confundi non debent, ut benè monet* Amesius. *Quin & ipse* Davenantius *latum discrimen facit inter Fidem & Opera, cum Fidem ideò justificare dicat, quod justitiam Christi apprehendat, ac nobis applicet. Id enim Fidei peculiare est, nec Operibus ullo modo tribui potest. Ex* Davenantii *igitur sententia, non partim fide, partim operibus, sed fide solâ justificamur.* *Ad* 2. That Conclusion is the same in effect with the former. Some internal Works must go before Justification, yet they do not therefore justifie as well as Faith. *Davenantius eo ipso loco negat opera necessaria esse ad justificationem, ut causas, sed tantùm ut ab obtinendam Equestrem dignitatem necessarium est adire aulam regiam, atque coram rege in genua se dimittere. Fidem autem* (*loco alio, atque alibi citato*) *dicit esse causam applicantem justitiam Christi, atque ideò ei tribui, quod proximè & immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam; Fidem nempe dici justificare, cum propriè justitia Christi fide apprehensa justificet; id quod ego mordicus teneo.* *Ad* 3. *De retinendo scilicet, & conservando Justificationis statu, anteà satis responsum est. Id nunc dico* Davenantium *nec in principio Justificationis, nec in progressu ejus vim virtutémque justificandi operibus juxta ac Fidei tribuere, etiamsi dicat bona opera ad Justificationis Statum retinendum & conservandum esse necessaria: id quod ego libenter agnosco. Cum enim in ipso Justificationis exordio Fidem operibus gravidam esse oportet, procedente demum Justificatione Fidem opera parere necesse est.* *Ad* 4. *Dico te extra oleas vagari, cum ego de Conditione Justificationis loquar, atque isti-*

De fide & operibus, cap. 14.

Contra Bellar. *Tom.* 4. *l.* 5. *c.* 5. §. 1.

De Justit. Hab. cap. 24. *Arg.* 8.

modi

usmodi quidem Conditione, quâ justificari dicimur, tu autem oppo-sis mihi authorem de operibus justificatorum (*i.e. Eorum, qui jam justificati sunt, & fide quidem, non operibus, ex authoris istius sententiâ*) *ad salutem necessariis differentem.* The Pages to which you further refer me, I cannot consult, my Edition differing from yours, as you might perceive by some places which I cited. But your Inference is of no force, as having no ground for it, *viz.* That if I will be of *Davenant*'s mind, I must be of yours. I do not see that *Davenant* doth attribute as much to Works as you do, who hold that they justifie, and urge the words of St. *James* for it, whereas *Davenant* (as I have shewed) makes Faith to justifie as apprehending and applying Christ's Righteousness, which surely Works cannot do. He saith also, *Opera sequuntur Justificationem, & præcedunt Glorificationem*, being not acquainted (it seems) with your distinction of Justification as Inchoated, and as Consummate at Judgment, whereby you would have Works to be as well a Condition of Justification, as of Glorification. What *Davenant* doth mean when he calleth Faith an Instrument, he doth sufficiently shew, making Faith to have a Causality in Justifying, by apprehending and applying Christ's Righteousness, by which we are justified. But do our greatest Divines give as much to Works as you do? This you will undertake (you say) to manifest. Why? then make it appear, that they hold Works to justifie as well as Faith, or to have a co-interest with Faith in the Effect of Justifying. Except you perform this, (which I presume you never will) you cannot make good your Undertaking. So do our greatest Divines give more to Faith than you. As you urge the τὸ ἔργον of St. *James* for being justified by Works, so you also insist upon the very Letter of St. *Paul*, and will have Faith it self to be properly our Righteousness, by which we are justified: This our greatest Divines do not no more than the other. Yet you stick not to brand them, as making Man his own Justifier and Pardoner. Νῦν σε ὑπὲρ φύσιν ἔφυς ὦδίνων; Truly this is over-grosse. What professed Adversary could reproach our greatest Divines more than thus? Whither will not a Man's partiality carry him, if he be let alone? May you not as well say, That Christ made some their own Saviours, because he said, That their Faith had saved them? I had thought that all the Glory did belong to the principal Agent, rather than to the Instrument. And to what purpose do you say, [*Who can forgive sins but God only?*] Do they that make Faith an Instrument of Justification, deny this any more than you, who make both Faith and Works Conditions of it?

De Justit. Act. cap. 32.

Yea,

Yea, some will have that *Monstrum horrendum*, and first-born of Abominations (as they phrase it) to be laid at your own door. For my part I shall say no more than this, That you seem as guilty this way your self, as they whom you censure, though neither you nor they (I think) are indeed guilty in this kind. Mr. *Rendal* against Mr. *Goodwin*, *cap.* 4. *p.* 140.

But why may not Man's Act be an Instrument of God's Act? Or to speak more properly, Man acting be an Instrument of God acting? We are workers together with God, 2 *Cor.* 6. 1. Surely not in a way of Co-ordination, but in a way of Subordination; and so Man may be God's Instrument. I am not therefore of your mind, but think, that the Gospel rather is properly a Means, and Ministers Instruments: though to be nice and curious about words, so that the Matter be sound and good, I do not love.

Ibid. & 88. 1. That Faith doth justifie, as it apprehendeth Christ, *appello totum Mundum Theologorum Reformatorum*; I have given you enough to this purpose before. Now to your Reasons why this is to set up τὸ *Credere*, I answer; *Ad* 1. Not *Apprehendere & Credere simpliciter*, but *Apprehendere & Credere in*, *i. e. Apprehendere Christum*, *& Credere in Christum*, are all one. And when it is said, That this doth justifie, the meaning is, *Christus fide apprehensus justificat*: so that this doth not set up τὸ *Credere*, as some do set it up, who make it as our Act simply considered, to be that Righteousness by which we are justified. *Ad* 2. Their meaning is not obscure, as you pretend, that you may the better oppose it. The Object of Faith, Christ's Righteousness apprehended by Faith, doth justifie: and so Faith is said to justifie, not as considered in it self, but in respect of its Object, which it apprehendeth, because it apprehendeth that, *viz.* Christ's Righteousness which doth justifie. *Ad* 3. The formal reason why Faith doth justifie, is its Apprehension, yet still that is in respect of the thing apprehended, *Causæ applicanti illud tribuitur quod immediatè pertinet ad rem applicatam. Id fides ipsi tribuitur, quod reapse Christo debetur*, as *Davenant* before cited doth express it, whose words you said were not against you, though none can be more in this Matter.

For the second Point you are quite mistaken. For I do not put a difference betwixt Justification and Right to Salvation, but betwixt Justification and Salvation it self, *i. e.* the full enjoyment of it, *viz.* Glorification. I have frequently expressed my self to this effect, That by Faith alone we are justified, and so have Right to Salvation; yet by VVorks and Obedience also we must come fully to enjoy Salvation.

In hoc Fœdere (*scil. Evangelico*, saith *Davenant*, *De Justit. Actual. cap.* 30. *pag. mihi* 396.) *ad obtinendam reconciliationem, justificationem, atque æternam vitam, non alia requiritur Conditio, quam veræ & vivæ fidei.* Presently after he explains himself thus; *Justificatio igitur, & jus* (*N. B.*) *ad æternam vitam ex Conditione solius Fidei suspenditur.*

By the way you may observe how he calls Faith the Condition, and the only Condition of our Justification, and yet he makes it not to be *Causa sine quâ non*, but *Causa Instrumentalis & Causa applicans*, as appears by his words before cited. Your following Arguments are not against me, you do but fight (as they say) with your own shadow. Yea, you having objected against your self, *Rom.* 5. 10. You answer directly as I use to do, *viz.* That *Paul* doth not distinguish betwixt Reconciliation and a Right to Salvation, but betwixt Reconciliation and actual (and Compleat) Salvation. You add, That *Paul* makes them both Fruits of Free Grace. And what Protestant (say I) doth not so? A necessity of good Works, as the way of attaining unto Salvation is asserted, yet it is denied that good VVorks are meritorious of Salvation. That in *Rom.* 8. 6. (whence you infer, That only Faith is not the Condition) proves not that Faith alone is not the Condition of Justification and Right to Salvation, which is all that I contend for. VVhat you mean by those words [*Life as well as Righteousness*] I do not know. Neither do I see what those Verses, 13, 14, 17. (*viz.* of *Rom.* 8.) are for your purpose. VVhereas by the way you say, [*Faith justifies, not* quà Instrumentum, vel Apprehensio proximè, sed quà Conditio præstita, *because Justification is given as a Reward; and Rewards are given on Moral Considerations, and not merely Physical*]; I have told you before, That I also include a Moral Consideration, and do not make Faith to justifie merely as it is of such an apprehensive Nature, but as being of such a Nature, God therefore in that respect hath been pleased to make choice of it for that end, that by it, apprehending Christ and his Righteousness (*i. e.* properly by Christ and his Righteousness apprehended by it) we should be justified.

FINIS.

THE SUBSTANCE OF Mr. Cartwright's EXCEPTIONS Considered.

BY

RICH. BAXTER.



LONDON,

Printed for *Nevil Simmons* and *Jonath. Robinſon*, at the Princes-Arms and Golden-Lion, in St. *Pauls* Church-yard, 1675.

310.04

The Substance of Mr. *Cartwright*'s Exceptions considered.

TO reply to these Exceptions *verbatim*, I conceive were a sinful loss of time, and a great wrong to to the Learned Author, and more to my self, and most of all to the Reader and the Truth. For it would unavoidably tire us all, and drown the Truth in a mountainous heap of useless Altercations; and the main business would be to manifest a Reverend Brother's mistakes, which I conceive may sooner kindle the fire of Anger, than the light of Information.

I shall therefore pass by all that part of the work, and only deal with the remaining Differences, which are the Soul of the Book, and that not in the Order as they lie, but as they seem of greatest moment, or are most insisted on by the Reverend Author.

The main substance of the Exceptions, consisteth of these points following:

1. That I say *Faith* (and secondarily *sincere Obedience*) are as to the Law of Works or Innocency, but the *Conditions* of our Justification by Christ's merits, from its condemning sentence: But they

are our material Righteouſneſs in reſpect to the *Law of Grace*; viz. *a particular ſubordinate Righteouſneſs*, becauſe a *Condition* of our Pardon and Salvation. But Mr. *C.* yieldeth that they *are ſuch a Condition*, but not that we are *juſtified by them*, or that they are our *Righteouſneſs* thereto.

2. That I make *Works* to have a *co-intereſt* with *Faith* in Juſtification.

3. That I make *Faith* to be *but a Condition* of our main Juſtification, conſiſting in remiſſion of ſin: But Mr. *C.* makes it a *Cauſe*, which he calleth *Cauſa applicans*.

4. That I make *two Laws*, and Mr. *C.* but *one*; only yieldeth to call the *Promiſe* the *New-Law*.

5. That I make the New Covenant a Law to have a *peculiar penalty*, which Mr. *C.* denieth.

6. That I make *Obedience* a Condition of our *right to Salvation*, [*Juris continuandi vel non amittendi*] though not of our firſt Righteouſneſs: And Mr. *C.* makes it a Condition of *Salvation it ſelf*, and not of *our right to it*; yet confeſſeth that it is the ſame thing that is the Condition of Juſtification, and of right to Salvation.

7. That Mr. *C.* makes the *Goſpel-Grant* to be properly, *A ſentence of Abſolution by God as Judg*; and I make it to be but *A Donation of pardon and life by God as Rector and Benefactor by Law, and Deed of Gift*, and ſo a *virtual*, not an *actual judicial Sentence*: Which yet I little ſtick on.

8. Mr. *C.* taketh the Judgment after this life to be no other or further Juſtification than we have here, but only a further *Declaration* of it: And I take it to be a deciſive Sentence, to put our right out of controverſie, giving us our *Jus Judicatum*,

as

as the *Promiſe* did our *Jus Conſtitutum*, and moreover, being the orderly means to our poſſeſſion.

As to the firſt of theſe Differences, I would know, Whether it be about the *Matter* or the *Word* that we diſagree? If the *Matter*, then Mr. *C.* would never have granted, 1. That Faith and Obedience is an *inherent* or *perſonal Righteouſneſs*, and ſo called commonly by Scripture and Divines. 2. That it is the *fulfilling* of the *Conditions* of the *New-Covenant*. 3. That if we be *accuſed* to have *no right* in Chriſt, becauſe we have *not fulfilled* this *Condition*, we muſt plead the *actual fulfilling of it* by our ſelves, or periſh; and not plead any fulfilling of it *by Chriſt* for us, nor any *pardon* for our *not fulfilling* it. 4. Yea, that even wicked men may have a true *particular Righteouſneſs*, (though not *this* which is the Condition of Salvation) I remember now no one *material* difference left between us.

And if it be only *Verbal*: 1. I conceive that the Diſpute, [*Whether the fulfilling of the Conditions of the New-Covenant may be called Righteouſneſs, or we be ſaid to be juſtified by it?*] when we are agreed in the *thing*, is not worth the contending about. 2. Mr. *C.* ſaith, *p.* 91. of his Exceptions, *Non oportet litigare de verbis cum de re conſtet.* 3. He confeſſeth (as is ſaid) that even a wicked Reprobate may have a *particular Righteouſneſs*, and owneth *Bradſhaw*'s ſo denominating it. He therefore that will yield that the *Devil* or a *Reprobate* may be called *righteous quoad cauſam particularem*, and that that is *Righteouſneſs*, methinks ſhould not deny it in our caſe. 4. He confeſſeth (for it is undeniable) that all our Divines do give the *name* of

Righteousness to our *inherent Righteousness*: Therefore *de nomine* we differ not. 5. He denieth not (for it is past denying) that *Scripture* often calleth our *Faith* and *sincere Obedience* by the name of *Righteousness*: So that when I so call it, I do but speak as the Holy Ghost hath taught me. Thus far then methinks, we should be fully agreed (as in sense so) that the *name* of *Righteousness* is lawful and fit to be applied to our Faith it self, and personal Obedience.

It remains then *de nomine*, whether we may say, 1. Either that this *Faith* or *Righteousness* doth *justifie us?* 2. Or that we *are justified by it?*

For the *former phrase*, I use not to say [*Faith justifieth:*] 1. Because it soundeth as if I made it an *efficient Cause*. 2. Because Scripture rather useth the *other* phrase. [*We are justified by Faith.*] Though there seem small difference in these speeches, yet indeed the latter best fitteth the nature of a *conditional* or *dispositive Interest*: And the Holy Ghost is the fittest Judg. But for the latter phrase, and the former taken in the same sense as the latter, *viz.* [*That Faith justifieth as a Condition*, and thence consequentially, as the *matter* of our *subservient particular Righteousness*,] I should think that here is no room for a disagreement. For,

1. None can deny but that I speak in the Language of the Holy Ghost, who saith, [*A man is justified by Works, and not by Faith only*;] and that [*by our words we shall be justified, and by our words we shall be condemned.*] Say not I mistake the *meaning* of these words; while, 1. Our Question is not *now* about the *meaning* or *matter*, but about the *fitness* of the *phrase*. 2. And the thing that I am

first

firſt blamed for, is not the miſunderſtanding of a particular Text, but of the *Doctrine* of Juſtification.

2. It is beyond all doubt a contradiction unworthy the Pen of any Learned man to ſay, *This is our Righteouſneſs, and yet will not* in tantum *juſtifie us*; (and *in totum*, I ever denied it as much as they:) *Forma proculdubio informat & denominat.*

3. *To juſtifie*, (in the ſenſe I uſe it) is (firſt) *to conſtitute Righteous*, (for I take it for *conſtitutive Juſtification* firſt:) But it may be ſaid, that we are *conſtituted Righteous* by *Faith* and *Obedience* (not ſpeaking of *univerſal Righteouſneſs*:) Therefore it may be ſaid we are *juſtified by them.*

Nothing can be ſaid to this Argument, but againſt the *minor*, by denying that the word [*Juſtifie*] is ever taken for *conſtituting Righteous*, but only for *ſentencing* us ſo: But I never yet met but with one Learned man, that I remember, that was of that mind. Our Divines ordinarily diſtinguiſh of *Juſtification conſtitutive and ſentential*: 1. His Reaſon is, becauſe it is ſtill taken *in ſenſu forenſi*, and ſo we maintain againſt the Papiſts. But I anſwer, Our Divines take not *ſenſum forenſem*, as excluding, but including, *ſenſum Legalem, vel Civilem* (as we commonly ſpeak) but only as excluding *ſenſum Ethicum*, as it ſignifieth merely our acts and qualities of *Ethical Juſtice* or *Virtue*. Now ſo I grant againſt the Papiſts, that Juſtification ſignifieth not moſt uſually nor very oft an infuſion of new Qualities; but 1. *Non reatum culpæ vel pœnæ*, which is Innocence and *Legal Righteouſneſs*. 2. *Sentential Abſolution*. Now I ſay no more, but, 1. That our *Non-reatus culpæ finalis impœnitentiæ & infidelitatis*

aut Rebellionis, is our *particular Righteouſneſs or Juſtification.* 2. Our *Non-reatus pœnæ propter hanc culpam* is founded herein as the *matter.* 3. Our *Non-reatus pœnæ æternæ* in general dependeth on this (at the laſt Judgment) as on a *Condition.* 2. I little doubt but Scripture (mentioning Juſtification by Faith) means it of *conſtitutive Juſtification*; and Mr. *C.* for ought I perceive, thinks ſo too, taking it and ſentential Juſtification for all one.

If then we may be ſaid to be [*made Righteous*] by *Faith* and *Obedience*, then we may be ſaid to be *juſtified* by them: But the former is true; Therefore, *&c.*

That Righteouſneſs which makes not righteous, is a thing never yet known, except it were only *nomen juſtitiæ ſine re*, and it were only equivocally ſo called. For *Righteouſneſs* is a mere *relative form*, and therefore muſt make, that is, formally *conſtitute* the *perſon righteous ſo far.* Even as there is no exiſtent *Worthineſs*, that makes not *worthy*; or *Guiltineſs*, that makes not *guilty*, or *Unrighteouſneſs*, that makes not ſo far *unrighteous*; or *Goodneſs*, that makes not ſo far *good:* I think none will contradict this.

4. I'll tell you what I will do? If godly Divines would not have me uſe *James*'s phraſe, and ſay, [*We are juſtified by Works,*] yea, or by *Obedience*, yea, or *by Faith*, as *Paul* ſpeaks, rather than wrong the Churches peace, I will utterly lay it by in ſpeech and writing; and I will only ſay, [*We are made righteous,*] and not, [*We are juſtified*] by them. And ſo in my Explication of our Righteouſneſs, I will ſay, that we have a twofold Righteouſneſs: 1. *Inherent perſonal Righteouſneſs* (*Evangelically* ſo called)

called;) which by reaſon of its exceeding Imperfection (for ſo I am content to ſpeak) will not juſtifie us of it ſelf in Judgment: This conſiſteth *inchoatively*, or at firſt, of *Faith and Repentance* without external Obedience; afterward, of *Faith continued*, and *Obedience added*. 2. The other *Righteouſneſs* is *meritoriouſly Chriſt's Satisfaction for our ſin*, and *formally the pardon of ſin it ſelf*, whereby the defaults of all our Faith, Obedience, and other Graces, together with all the ſins of our lives, are remitted, or our *jus ad impunitatem & regnum*. Our Faith or Obedience is none, no not the leaſt part of this Righteouſneſs of Remiſſion, and right to Life: But yet Chriſt in granting his Act of Pardon or Grace, did *except final Infidelity and Impenitency* out of it: And therefore as he *pardoneth* none ſuch, ſo his *Righteouſneſs* of *Remiſſion* alway ſuppoſeth concurrent our *perſonal Righteouſneſs* (quâ talis, *not to be remitted*;) Chriſt never died to purchaſe us pardon for loving God, hating Sin, Repenting, Obedience, *&c.* but only for *the ſin* that adheres to theſe in their deficiency or evil company. Why may not this much reconcile us?

Nay, Note theſe two things:

1. That Mr. *C.* in his pleading for an imperfect Righteouſneſs, ſo denominated from its Conformity to the Law, *page* 68, 69. profeſſeth, that [*Accepting for Righteous, and accounting juſt, is as much as juſtifying*;] and that, [*it is the New-Covenant that ſo accepteth our Works, as they are a ſincere, though imperfect, Conformity to the Law as a Rule*;] and that; [*for his part he ſhould ſay, that we and our actions are juſtified from the Law of Works*, i. e. *from the Condemnation of it.*] Now is not here

here as much, or more by far, than I ſay for Works?

1. More: For I do not think that God's acceptance of our Works, is a *juſtifying* them from the *Law's Condemnation*; but that they are *unjuſtifiable*, and ſtill *condemned* by the Law, and that the Goſpel was never of force to ſave *mens Works* from the *Law's Condemnation*, but only to ſave the *perſon*: Nay, that if the *Works* be not *condemned* by the *Law*, the *perſon* cannot be *juſtified* by Chriſt, but muſt be juſtified by his *Works*: For *juſtified Works* will *juſtifie* the *perſon*, ſo far as they are *juſtified*; and if the *Works* be *not condemned*, the *perſon* cannot be *condemned* for them.

2. But I intend not this as an Accuſation of his Opinion; for I believe he meaneth ſoundly: But then at leaſt conſider, Whether this be not as much as I ſay? He alloweth here, and profeſſeth to uſe the term [*Juſtification of our Works*] as the *ſubjecti*: And if it be fit to ſay, *God juſtifieth* our *Works*, then what man can deviſe a Reaſon why it is not as fit to ſay, *God juſtifieth us thereby?* ſo far *in tanto*, though not *in toto*: For as *Bradſhaw* truly ſaith, *Every Juſtification of the cauſe, is indeed a Juſtification of the perſon.* I take it for granted therefore, that Mr. *C.* alloweth me to ſay, that we are juſtified by *our Works and Faith* as our *particular Righteouſneſs*, by a particular Juſtification: Yea, he in other places plainly expreſſeth as much. Now he muſt needs know, that I often told him, I take it but for a *particular Righteouſneſs*, and to be but *Materia Juſtificationis particularis, & conditio Juſtificationis plenariæ, vel (ſuppoſitâ conditione præſtitâ) univerſalis.*

2. Note

2. Note alſo, That he gives it as the very ſum of all his Anſwer on this point, that [*our Faith (and Obedience)* as an *imperfect Conformity* to the *Law*, is a *particular Righteouſneſs*, and ſo it juſtifieth not; but as it is the *Condition* of the *Covenant*, it juſtifieth, and ſo it is no *Righteouſneſs*.] Now it is here granted, that a *perſonal Righteouſneſs* is requiſite to our *Juſtification*, though not as *Righteouſneſs*. If Faith, which is our Righteouſneſs, be neceſſary, though not *as* our Righteouſneſs, but as a *Condition*; for my part I have all that I deſire for ſubſtance in his Conceſſion, that *Faith juſtifieth as a Condition*. The reſt is but of the *name*: And of the name himſelf ſaith, *p.* 40. [*The Queſtion is not, Whether we be ſaid to be juſtified by our Works or Words* (that he confeſſeth) *but how and in what ſenſe we are to be ſo juſtified: There is a particular Juſtification, and a declarative Juſtification: Thus we are juſtified by our Works and Words; but a full and formal Juſtification is only by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, through Faith imputed to us.*

But what Reaſon gives he through the whole, why Faith is no *Righteouſneſs* as a *Condition*? He ſaith ſtill, that [*It is no new Accuſation to be accuſed of not-performing the Conditions of the New Covenant, but a making good the former.*] But it is moſt evidently a diſtinct ſubordinate *Accuſation* towards the making good the firſt. Is the *means* and *end* all one? Is it all one to accuſe a Traytor of being liable to death for *Treaſon* merely as ſuch; and to accuſe him of not performing the Conditions in an Act of *General Pardon*? and ſo having no benefit by that Act for his eſcape? The *words* are not the ſame, nor the ſenſe the ſame, therefore the Accu-

ſation

ſation is not the ſame. Thoſe things which are diviſible are not the ſame: But theſe are diviſible; *ergo*, &c. The Devils may be accuſed of being guilty of death for ſin as ſin; but not of *non*-performance of Conditions of Recovery: For a mere Negation is no ground of Guilt or Accuſation.

But he thinks, that [*the Law conſtituteth the* officium Credendi, *and the Covenant the Condition; therefore as a Condition performed, it is no Righteouſneſs; and as a Duty performed, no juſtifying Righteouſneſs, but particular.*] I anſwer, 1. If this were all ſo, yet when the Covenant doth take *one Legal duty* for its *Condition*, our Salvation may lie on that *particular Righteouſneſs*. 2. Will it, or may it ever be queſtioned in Judgment, or not, *Whether we have performed the Condition of the New-Covenant?* I think it will be the *main* Queſtion: I am ſure in *Conſcience* it is the main. If it may ever be queſtioned, *Whether we have right in the Promiſe and Chriſt's blood or no*, I know no way of Legal evincing it, but by producing the *Deed of Gift*, or our *performance* of the *Condition*. All the doubt then to be diſcuſſed will be of the latter; and on this will Reprobates begin to plead, [*Lord we have done thus and thus*;] for the *Gift* will be undeniable. Now if this will be a *Cauſe* to be pleaded at Judgment (yea, for ought I can underſtand by God's Word, the great Cauſe of the day,) then certainly the Defendant will be *Guilty*, or *Not-Guilty*; and his Cauſe will be *juſt*, or *unjuſt*. If he have *juſtitiam Cauſæ*, then Mr. *C.* is miſtaken; if he have not, the man is condemned. Mr. *C.* is very much out to imagine (and make it the ſubſtance of moſt of his Anſwers in the main Queſtion) that our performance

performance of *a Condition as ſuch*, may not be a *Righteouſneſs*. What if it were granted to be no *Ethical Righteouſneſs* (and yet I am loth *Covenant-breakers* ſhould have ſo much countenance, or that *God's Covenant-keeping* ſhould be denied the name of *Righteouſneſs*;) doth it follow that it is not a *judiciary Righteouſneſs*, a *juſtitia forenſis* which is *neareſt* to our great Juſtification?) If Contractors enter a Suit one againſt another for not-*keeping Covenants*, may not, muſt not the Accuſed or Defendants Cauſe be *juſt*, or *unjuſt*? If a man enter an Action againſt another for not-performing a *Promiſe*, for not-doing what by *Leaſe* or other *Covenant* he was bound to; I think the Law will pronounce him and his Cauſe *juſt*, or *unjuſt*; and acquit and juſtifie him, or elſe condemn him accordingly. If it be capable of being a *Cauſe in Law*, or the matter of an *Action* or Suit, then it is moſt neceſſary a righteous or unrighteous Cauſe. But,

3. I do not think it tolerable ſo to exclude the *Law as a Law* from this work. For,

1. The *very Covenant* is a Law, even the *promiſory part*: I prove it, 1. God is ſo ſuper-eminently and tranſcendently above us, and our abſolute Sovereign, that we are not capable of entring into a ſtrict Covenant (as among equals) but ſuch as participateth of the nature of a Law. We have ſo wholly our dependance on him, and good from him, that he can make no *Law* of *favour*, or for our *good*, but ſo far it muſt be as a *Benefactor* (it being otherwiſe with earthly Sovereigns, whoſe Subjects receive not all their propriety from them:) And alſo he is ſo conjunctly our *abſolute Sovereign*, that he can enter no *Contract* with us but *authoritatively*.

2. From

2. From the Definition: A Law taken most fitly, though largely (for *jus Constituens*, adequate to *jus Constitutum*; and not for *Lex*, as its narrowly taken as distinct from *Precept*, *Priviledges*, *Contracts*, &c.) this true proper *Law* is but *Constitutio debiti Authoritativa*; or, *Signum voluntatis Rectoris debitum Constituens*. Now *Constituere debitum præmii*, is as true an Act of *this Law* (though *every Law* have it not, which made some exclude it;) as *constituere debitum officii*. Yea, acts of absolute *free Grace* or *Pardon* are *true Laws*. So that God did make the *New-Covenant* as *Benefactor* and *Legislator* both; and so gave the Legal *jus ad Beneficium*, and constituted the *Condition* of his own Gift.

2. Besides, I am not yet of Mr. *C*'s mind, that the *Precept* it self, which he calls the Law, is not a real part of the *Covenant*. What though it be part of the *Law?* so it may be, and of the *Covenant too*; for the *Covenant* (as Mr. *Lawson* hath well shewed) is truly a *Law*, called a *Covenant* from the more excellent part (the *Promise*) and from God's Condescention, and from man's requisite Consent: Yet called a *Law*, as being the *authoritative Constitution* of what shall be *due to us* (good or evil) and what shall be *due from us* for the obtaining of one, and escaping the other. But of this more anon about the Law.

3. Nay, as Unrighteousness condemneth not directly, as it is contrary to *Duty*, but as it is contrary to the *Condition of Life*, and is the Condition of the Threat: So when it concerneth Judgment, the word *Righteousness* doth most nearly belong to Duty as a Condition, and remotely to Duty as Duty performed.

2. The

2. The ſecond Queſtion or Point of Difference, [*I make Works to have a co-intereſt with Faith in Juſtification.*]

But how? It is ſure confeſſed not in our *firſt Juſtification*, and that it is principally in our laſt great Juſtification at Judgment. Do I advance Works higher than others? or do I not rather ſeem to depreſs Faith lower? I never made Works to be the the *inſtrumental Cauſe* of Juſtification, as others do *Faith*. I never made them the *cauſa applicans*, as Mr. *C.* makes Faith. I never made them *any proper cauſe*. I do aver in the end of my Anſwer to him, that I give *leſs to Faith*, but *no more* to *Works* than others.

His Anſwer is this: [*Why? then make it appear that they hold Works to juſtifie as well as Faith, or to have a co-intereſt with Faith in the effect of juſtifying: Except you perform this (which I preſume you never will) you cannot make good your undertaking.*] *Anſ.* I have proved over and over, that they affirm *Repentance* a *Condition* of Pardon; and *Obedience* a *Condition* of final *Juſtification*. If I prove that they do thus, and that I do no more, do I not prove that I give no more to Works than they? What, muſt I prove that they give *no more* to Faith, and *ſo* make *no greater inequality* than I, before I can prove that they give *as much to Works*? The co-intereſt of a Condition I can prove by forty of them, that they give as far I: But muſt I prove that they give *Obedience* the co-intereſt of *a cauſe*, which I deny my ſelf?

So

So I did in the next lines cite *Davenant*, saying the very ſame words as I, and as fully as I deſire, and largely explaining and proving them. Yet *Davenant* ſaid well, and I ſay ill, when I am ready to ſubſcribe to his words in the ſenſe as they muſt plainly import, or with a Proteſtation to underſtand them as rightly as I can: If this be not *non ex fide perſonas, ſed ex perſonis fidem*, &c. as *Tertul.* what is?

And what is the Difference? Why it is ſaid, [*Dicâ te extra oleas vagari, cum ego de conditione Juſtificationis loquor, atq; ejuſmodi quidem conditione quâ Juſtificari dicimur: tu autem opponis mihi authorem de operibus Juſtificatorum, i. e. eorum qui jam Juſtificati ſunt, & fide quidem, non operibus, ex authoris iſtius ſententia, ad ſalutem neceſſariis diſſerentem.*]

Reſp. 1. *Putàſſem propiùs ad rem controverſam pertinere, quid ego loquor, & de quali conditione, quam tum, cum ego rei & tu actoris partes agis?*

2. *Nonne* Davenantius *etiam loquitur de conditione? & de conditione ſine qua non? & de conditione ad Juſtificationis ſtatum retinendum & conſervandum? imo de conditione concurrente vel præcurſoriâ? Ipſiſſima authoris verba ſunt.*

3. *Nonne & ego de Juſtificatorum operibus ſemper ſum locutus, quando dixi ea ad Juſtificationem continuandam eſſe neceſſaria.*

It is further anſwered by Mr. *C.* to the fifth Concluſion, [*Some internal Works muſt go before Juſtification, yet they do not therefore juſtifie as well as Faith.* Davenantius *eo ipſo loco negat opera neceſſaria eſſe ad Juſtificationem ut cauſas, ſed tantum ut ad obtinendam equeſtrem dignitatem*, &c. *Fidem autem*

(*alio*

(alio loco) dicit esse causam applicantem justitiam Christi, atq; ideo ei tribuit quod proxime & immediate pertinet ad rem applicatam, &c.]

Reply. 1. Doth not he say, that they are necessary [*ut conditiones præcursoriæ?*] If they are *Conditiones*, they have the *interest* of *Conditions* in Justification. I say not, [*They justifie us*,] because that phrase sounds as if I ascribed an *efficiency* to them; but only, that [*we are justified by them as Conditions.*] And to say, [It is a Condition of Justification, and yet we may not be justified by it as by a Condition] is no better than to say, [Such a thing is an efficient, but causeth not as an efficient.] I deny them to be *Causes* as well as he.

2. And what if you proved that he makes Faith *a Cause*, when I do not, and so doth not so nearly equal them as I? Doth that prove that I give *more to Works* than he? or rather that I give *less to Faith?* He that will affirm, that he ascribeth no more to Works than you, is but sorrily confuted by your saying, that he ascribeth *less to Faith*, that is, that he gives Works a *co-interest* with Faith: Which he may do, by derogating from *Faith* (or from your estimation of it) without adding any further dignity or power to Works.

Mr. *C.* gives this as his summary Answer, [*Your first inference is of no force, as having no ground*, viz. *that if I will be of* Davenant's *mind, I must be of yours. I do not see that* Davenant *doth attribute as much to Works as you do.* (2.) *Who hold, that they justifie; and urge,* (3.) *the words of St.* James *for it; whereas* Davenant (4.) *makes Faith to justifie;* (5.) *as apprehending and applying Christ's Righteousness, which surely Works cannot.* He saith also,

(6.) *Opera ſequuntur Juſtificationem & præcedunt Glorificationem*; *being not acquainted it ſeems with your diſtinction of Juſtification, as Inchoate, and as Conſummate at Judgment, whereby you would have Works to be as well a Condition of Juſtification as of Glorification.*

Rep. If ever words were ſpoke againſt moſt *expreſs evidence in terminis*, I think theſe are; 1. That my words were groundleſs, when I have no fitter expreſſions of my own mind, than in *Davenant*'s words. 2. I hold not, [*that they juſtifie*,] but that [*we are juſtified by them*,] which phraſe better fits a mere Condition than the former. 3. I take the words of *James* to be Scripture; and doth it prove, that I give more to *Works* than *Davenant*, becauſe I cite the expreſs words of Scripture? What if I miſunderſtand that Scripture? doth it follow that I give more to Works? 4. Is this an Argument to ground your Accuſation on [Davenant *makes Faith to juſtifie, as apprehending and applying Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*: *Works cannot ſo do*?] What then? *therefore* Davenant *gives leſs to Works than you?* A ſorry conſequence! Or is it, [*Therefore* Davenant *makes not Works to juſtifie.*] *Anſw.* Nor I, if you take it efficiently, as you ſay, *Davenant* doth make *Faith a Cauſe*. But, 1. Is not this his giving *more to Faith*, and not *leſs than I to Works?* 2. Doth he not ſay, that Works are Conditions of Juſtification, ſome *precurſory* and *concomitant*, and ſome for *continuing it?* And I ſtill profeſs, that we are juſtified by them but as *Conditions*. If you ſay, I call them *Righteouſneſs* by which we are juſtified, I have anſwered that before; that is *lis de nomine*, and I ſo call them but *à poſteriore*, becauſe they are *Conditions*

ditions of our *Justification*, and you and *Davenant* call them *a particular Righteousness* as well as I. I still say, as to our *universal Justification*, they have no further interest than the very *essence* of a *Condition imports*; and if *Davenant* give them not this, he was to blame to tell us otherwise. 5. I make Faith also to justifie [*as Apprehending and Applying*,] if you do not take the word [*As*] strictly *pro ratione formali*, but as signifying Faith's *special aptitude* to a preheminence in this Work: And I affirm, that *Works* do *not justifie* as *Apprehending* or *Applying*: (still remember, that when I use the phrase [*Faith justifieth*,] I use it in Conformity to your Discourse, and mean it as is before explained. 6. Do not I say, as well as he, that *opera sequuntur Justificationem & præcedunt Glorificationem*? and doth it thence follow, that he was unacquainted with my distinction of Justification *Inchoate and Consummate* at *Judgment*? Why? 1. You know the same man was acquainted with the distinction between *Justification Inchoate and continued*. 2. And that that he saith *Works follow Justification*, makes them *precursory Conditions* of *Justification*, and *Conditions* of its *Continuance*? and so plainly acquaints you, that it is those *external Works*, which he makes *Conditions* of *continuing Justification*, which he saith, *follow* it; which no doubt but they do. 3. Think you then, that this Learned man did not know, that Christ would come again to judg the quick and the dead? and so could distinguish between Justification *here* and *hereafter*? Or did he ever dream, that the Saints should be *judged*, and yet not *justified then*? why, then they must be *condemned*? For *Judging* is the *Genus*, and hath but those two *species*.

But I have ſpoke further to this than I intended.

The ſum of my Reply to this Queſtion is this: 1. *I never gave Works a co-intereſt with Faith, in cauſing or effecting our Juſtification*: For I never gave *Faith* ſuch an *intereſt*. 2. I never gave *Works* an *equal intereſt* with Faith. 3. I never gave *external Works any intereſt* in our *firſt Juſtification*. Only to that I require, that the Faith be ſuch as Mr. *C.* himſelf ſo much pleads for, *A working Faith*, or *non renuens operari*; or that hath Works in it *Virtually*, (as taking Chriſt for King to be obeyed.)

Contr. 3. The next Difference between us is this: *Mr.* C. *makes Faith to be* Cauſa applicans *of our Juſtification; and I make it to be but a Condition.*

I underſtand my own term partly, but I underſtand not his: What Cauſe is this *Cauſa applicans*? As far as I underſtand him, he meaneth an *efficient Cauſe*: And that which is an *efficient*, may be ſaid to *effect*. Here is the difference then, I do not make Faith to *effect* the *pardon of any ſin*, that is, *to pardon me* (as a leſs principal Cauſe:) But had Mr. *C.* given us this *Cauſality of Faith* in any notion familiar to us Logicians of the lower Form, we ſhould better have known what to make of it. In the mean time ſhould I preſume but to paſs my Conjecture which of the ſorts of *Efficients* he intends, perhaps I might wrong him by my miſtakes; yet let theſe two things be remembred: 1. That I hereby give *leſs to Faith*, but not *more to Works*. 2. That I only *excuſe my ſelf*, for not calling Faith,

A

A Cause of Justification: But I do not *accuse others* that so call it, nor will I contend with them about it, if they mean a moral Cause, or *per accidens only*, if they will give me leave to forbear. And though anon I shall shew, that I hope you may yet mean the same as I by *Causa applicans*, that it is but *dispositio causæ materialis, id est, Recipientis*; yet because so great a number of great Divines call it the *instrumental Cause*, I must first speak to that sense, on that supposition.

And here I remember Mr. *C*'s next words to those even now cited: [*Do our Divines give more to Faith than you? 1. As you urge the* τὸ ἐμπὸν *of St.* James, *for being justified by Works; so you also insist upon the very letter of St.* Paul, *and will have Faith it self to be properly our Righteousness by which we are justified: This our greatest Divines do not, no more than the other.*]

Reply. 1. I had rather be accused of adhering too close to the words of the Holy Ghost, than of departing causelesly from them.

2. How oft have I told you over and over, that I make Faith to be no further our Righteousness, than as it is the *Condition* of our *Righteousness merited by Christ?* And knowing this, could you think and say, that I give more to Faith than your self, who say, it is the *Condition* as well as I? Sure the *naming* of this *Condition* by the *name Righteousness*, is not giving *more* to it! If it be, 1. You cannot say so, that use the name your self; 2. And here seem to confess I have [*the very letter*] of *Scripture* for it: And that's enough I think to justifie the *name*, while I agree with you in the *thing*.

He proceeds thus: [*Yet you ſtick not to brand them as making man his own Juſtifier or Pardoner,* Ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων. *Truly this is over-groſs: What profeſſed Adverſary could reproach our greateſt Divines more than thus? Whither will not a man's partiality carry him, if he be let alone? May you not as well ſay, that Chriſt made ſome their own Saviours, becauſe he ſaid, that their Faith had ſaved them? I had thought that all the glory did belong to the principal Agent, rather than to the Inſtrument.*]

Reply. Where I have offended God in wronging men, I deſire and hope for pardon. Yet if I may give a true account of my words, I muſt ſay, 1. That I would have you review, whether it be you or I that broke the Ninth Commandment. I did not ſay, that theſe Divines do make man his own Juſtifier; but only that [*I give not to Faith, and ſo to man ſo much as they, not daring to make man his own Juſtifier.*] I am afraid *I ſhould be guilty* of this, if I ſaid, that Faith effecteth our Juſtification: Doth it follow that I ſay, *They are guilty of it?* I think not, for all your anger. For Conſequences are not to be faſtened upon men that diſown them, at leaſt, as *directly* guilty of them: *I ſee them*, or ſeem to my ſelf ſo to do; it would therefore bring that guilt *on me*, if I held their opinion, though it may not on them (unleſs remotely.)

2. I never once thought of charging the men as holding, that they juſtifie themſelves; but only I charged *their opinion* with it conſequentially. And muſt the Reverence of men prohibite us to mention or intimate the ill Conſequences of their miſtakes? Then hath the Serpent got the day, when he

he hath once lodged his errours in Reverend breasts: It will be no more lawful to disturb him, if he be once so housed. Who is he that liveth, and erreth not? What errour in Morality hath not absurd and vile Consequents? If we *mention* them, it seems we are *given up* to a lamentable state of sin.

3. I now understand why you heap up the words of some *late Reverend Divines*, which I thought did make up *utramq; paginam* in your Exceptions; and though themselves might receive a fair Answer, yet did seem your most irrefragable Argument. But if this be so, it's vain to dispute any more: For if I bring Scripture or Reason, you may say, The Divines are against it. If I argue against their Opinions, by shewing their absurdities, you may say, What *professed Adversary* could *reproach them more?* It's *too gross* to charge Absurdities or ill Consequents on a Doctrine that such men hold. Then must mistakes dare us and deride us, when they are got into these holts, we can follow them no further.

4. What say you by *Amesius*, that saith, That there is such a Concatenation of Truths, that whoever denies one, and holdeth one errour, doth by Consequence overthrow the Foundation? *Cas. Cons.* I am not of his mind, unless it be limited to some kind of Truths: But it seems then he thought, that consequentially *every errour* denied Christ the Foundation: How far was this man given up to reproach, not only the late Reverend Divines, but all men living? far more than I.

5. M. *C.* thinks that Christ's *active Righteousness* in obeying the *Moral Law*, is not *imputed* to us for our *Righteousness*. I suppose his Reason is much drawn from several Absurdities or ill Consequents

which he thinks will follow, if the contrary be aſſerted: Perhaps, that it will make Chriſt's death needleſs or vain; (for thoſe that ſay as he, do charge it with no leſs.) Muſt I therefore lament the condition of Mr. *C.* as one left of God, to reproach all thoſe Churches and Divines that are againſt him, as bad as their profeſſed Adverſaries do? and ſay, He makes them deny the death of Chriſt?

6. If I muſt believe as the Church believes, which Church is it? why am I not as excuſable for being loth to reproach the Church of Chriſt for 1200, if not 1400 years after Chriſt (who never made Faith *the Inſtrument* of *juſtifying*, that I could yet find) as accuſable for reproaching ſome part of the Divines of *Europe* for 150 years, by declaring the Reaſon of my diſſent from the ill Conſequence of their Opinions? If we muſt go to the *Poll*, neither you nor I ſhall be well pleaſed; if to the *Ballance*, to weigh the Authority of Divines, where dwells he that muſt hold the ſcales?

7. Either we may charge *Conſequences* on the owners of miſtakes, or not: If not, then how come I to be charged with this hainous crime; which can be no way made good, but by pretending ſuch Conſequence? If we may, then *I might do it*; which yet I did not on the *men*, but their *Opinion*.

8. If this Conſequence follow not their Doctrine, then diſprove it. My proof is this: [He that ſaith, The act of my Believing is the efficient Cauſe of my Juſtification, doth conſequently ſay, that I juſtifie my ſelf: But, *&c.* therefore.] The *major* is plain, in that, [If the act be an *Inſtrument*, it is the *Agents Inſtrument*: But I am the Agent; therefore.] And

if

if I do by this *Inſtrument* produce the effect, then I do pardon my ſelf, for that's the effect.

9. You ſay, [*Whither will a man's partiality carry him, if he be let alone?*] 1. That *Partiality* was the cauſe either you *do know*, or you *do not*. If you *do not*, according to my ſimple Opinion, you ſhould not have ſo ſentenced: If you *do know it*, then either *directly* by ſeeing my *heart* from *York* hither; (which I will not ſuppoſe you to pretend to:) Or elſe by ſome certain *ſign*. Suppoſe you have ſigns of my reproaching our Divines, yet prove by your ſigns that I did it through *partiality:* I ſay again, *prove it*. 2. If it were from partiality, then it is by ſiding with ſome *other party* againſt you, whom I prefer before you: That party is either my ſelf alone, or *ſome others*. If others, who be they? Papiſts or Proteſtants? or who? I know no party on Earth that I prefer before them, or equal with them (which I ſpeak on ſuppoſition that I know my own heart as well as you do.) If it be my ſelf, then the Charge is much higher: But the prover muſt be καρδιαγνώστης. To value my own judgment before ſo many, and ſuch men, and thence ſo to reproach them, I confeſs is a hainous crime: where I know nothing by my ſelf, yet am I not thereby juſtified. But ſurely, if I do know my own heart, I am partial in all my ſtudies, for thoſe men whom I am charged to be partial againſt, even againſt my ſelf, and all others now living: But the light of appearing-Truth is that which forceth me to differ from them; and if I am miſtaken, I have not yet learned a remedy. But certain I am, that partly *partiality for theſe* Reverend men, and partly the lothneſs to incur their cenſures, and eſpecially

ly lothneſs to occaſion their offence and diſquiet, have been ſo ſtrong a temptation to me to ſhut my eyes, that I have been ſometimes provoked to ſay, [*Depart from me; this knowledg is an ungrateful burthen, an offence to my deareſt Friends, and makes men take me as a man of Contention:*] ſed vicit veritas, (if I miſtake not.)

I think he that conſiders, 1. That you have *that party* on your ſide who are a ſtronger temptation to partiality than any party (beſides Chriſt, his Truth, and the ſame men in other things,) that I have to ſway me againſt them. 2. And that you ſo much *uſe their words*, where I conceive better Arguments are wanting, may perhaps ſee cauſe to put it again to the enquiry, Who is more likely in this Cauſe to be partial?

1. As for your inference from Chriſt's words, [*Thy Faith hath ſaved thee.*] I reply, 1. Chriſt did not ſay, that I can find, [*Thy Faith is the efficient inſtrumental cauſe of thy Salvation,*] nor I think any thing equipollent: For I ſuppoſe he intended no more than the intereſt of a *Moral Condition*; if you take it to be ſpoken of ſaving him from his *diſeaſe*, or from the *guilt* of ſin. But if you can prove, that it was ſpoken of ſaving him from the *power* of ſin by further Sanctification, then I will yield, that their Faith was ſome cauſe. 2. So far as a man is the efficient of his own Salvation, I think he may properly be called his own *Saver:* Men are called in Scripture the Saviours of others; why not as truly of themſelves, when they are ſaid to ſave themſelves? If it be unfit (as it is) to uſe the word *Saviour* in this ſenſe, of a mere man, the Reaſon is not from any Logical unfitneſs (unleſs that ſo full a name ſhould

not

not be unlimitedly given to him, that is the cause of one part of Salvation, and not the rest;) but it is, because it will be justly offensive, now Christ hath made this his proper name. But can you prove, that man doth as truly *pardon himself*, as he doth *reform himself* further by Faith? and so that Logically there is no more against calling him his *own Pardoner* or *Justifier*, than [*the Saver of himself from actual sin.*]

11. You say, you [*had thought all the glory had belonged to the Agent, and not to the Instrument.*]

Reply. 1. We were not speaking of the *glory*, which is a *Moral Interest* (where spoke I a word of that?) but of the *Natural Efficiency*. 2. I never was of your mind, nor ever shall be I think. I know as the creature compared to God is *nothing*, so its honour compared to his is *nothing*; and I know its honour, as well as its essence and existence, is all derived from God. But I think God puts an honour upon every Instrument that he useth, and most in their best and noblest Works. Proved, 1. The *Relation to God*, the *principal Agent*, puts an honour on it, to be *Instrumentum Dei*. 2. The Relation to the *end* or *happy effect*, puts an honour on on it. 3. Every Instrument hath an *Aptitude* to its office, and that *Aptitude* is honourable. 4. All *free Agents* have a *Moral honour* in being instrumental to any good, in that they act it *voluntarily*. 5. God will *commend* the *Moral actions* of his people, that were but mere *Conditions* of the effect; therefore surely those that were *Instruments*: And Gods *commendation* doth both suppose them *honourable*, and *put a glory* or *honour* upon them.

3. But if it must be as you say you thought it to be,

yet I pray you remember to do me this right, as when-ever I give *more to Obedience*, or *leſs to Faith* than you would have me, do not charge me with derogating from the *honour of Faith*, ſeeing *no glory* is due to it as an *Inſtrument!* And if I do give leſs to Chriſt than you, tell me of it, and ſpare not.

He next asks, [*Whether they that make Faith an Inſtrument, do deny any more than I (who make both Faith and Works Conditions) that none but God can forgive ſins?*]

Reply. I think they do deny it more than I. I confeſs they do not make man the *principal Cauſe*; but in making him the *Inſtrumental*, they make him as an *Inſtrument under God* to *pardon himſelf*, I think. The effect may be aſcribed to every Cauſe, according to the nature and proportion of its Cauſality: But *Conditions* are *no Cauſes* as ſuch.

2. You make both *Faith and Works Conditions* of *Salvation*; *i. e.* Glorification: And is not that as much againſt the honour of Chriſt, as making them the Conditions of Juſtification in Judgment? If it were true, that one were diſhonourable to him, it would be as true of the other; but is indeed true of neither.

Here I remember the like great offence that you took before at theſe few words [James *took not* Calvin's *counſel*;] when you had ſaid, Calvin's *counſel was not to uſe the phraſe, of being juſtified by Works.* And you ſay, that [*it contains nothing but a taunt againſt* Calvin, *and that it's unworthy uſage of ſo Reverend a man.*]

Reply. Truly, I do reverence ſcarce any name, ſince the Apoſtles days, or at leaſt ſince *Auſtin*, more than *Calvin*'s: And there was not in me, that

I know of a taunting intent; nor do I see any thing in those words that contain such unworthy usage as you express. The words signifie but this, [James *his practice was contrary to the counsel that* Calvin *there gives, not to use the terms, of being justified by Works*:] I thought the Emperor or the Pope would have endured as hard language as this. Certain I am, the greatest persons in honour Ecclesiastical or Civil that ever I knew, would not have taken it for such unworthy usage (as far as I can be certain by their making lighter of far worse.) Truly I fear, that this extream high expectation of such superlative Honour in the Ministers, is the great thing that threatens our calamity: When the example of the fall of the Roman Clergy by *Luther*, hath no more humbled us.

After this again, you bid me, [*put not off* Calvin *with a taunt, as I did before.*] But I have said more to these by-pages than I thought to have done.

The sum of all is this, I understand not what Cause it is that you call *Causa applicans*, till you tell me. But I verily think that you are of my mind, and do not know it, and that you mean with Dr. *Twisse causam dispositivam* (for so he oft saith, Faith is of Justification;) which is but *DispositioRecipientis*, and is part of the subjective material Cause, and no efficient at all; some call it a passive receiving Instrument: And indeed *conditio præstita* is *dispositio moralis recipientis* In the mean time, I pray you take it rather for a *depressing Faith* (which yet you say the glory belongs not to as *Instrument*) than for an *advancing Works*, if I say that *Faith* is *no efficient Cause* of Justification.

Contr.

Controv. 4. [*Mr.* C. *acknowledgeth but one Law, from which the Covenant is diſtinct; and I make two diſtinct Laws.*

To this I have ſpoken at large to others, and therefore ſhall ſay little now; the rather, becauſe I take what is ſaid to Mr. *C.* to remain ſatisfactory for all his Anſwers. Only I ſhall briefly explain my meaning about this.

Prop.* 1. A *Law* is *Debiti (vel juris) conſtitutio Authoritativa, vel ſignum voluntatis Rectoris debitum conſtituens. This Definition is not of *Lex*, as diſtinct from *Precept*, *Privileg*, *Contract*, in the narrow ſenſe; but as it is the *Conſtitution* of all *Moral right* or *due*, and ſo the *act* is adequate to the *product debitum.* This is called *Jus*; which word ſignifieth both *Jus Conſtituens*, and *Jus Conſtitutum.* The firſt is, *Law* in the *true general nature* of it; the ſecond is *Debitum.* Even *Contracts* do oblige by an exerciſe of that *Imperium* which a man hath over his *own actions* and himſelf; Or elſe they are not efficiently obligatory at all, but only the *Antecedent Conditions*; which when man hath put, *God ſeconds* them with an Obligation.

Prop. 2. The parts of a Law are two: 1. One is the *Conſtitution of what ſhall be due from us.* This is called *Precept*, *de agendo vel non agendo* (which is *Prohibition:*) This conſtituteth the *debitum officii.* 2. The ſecond is the *Conſtitution* of *what ſhall be due to us.* This is twofold: 1. Of *Good.* 2. Of *Evil.* 1. Of *Good:* And that is twofold, 1. *Abſolutely given,*

given, without any *Condition*; which is commonly called the act of *God quà Benefactor*, but so is all *giving* whatsoever; yet is it his act as *Legislator* too. 2. *Conditionally*: Which hath two acts, 1. To *constitute* the *Jus ad Datum*, or the *Debitum beneficii*. 2. To constitute the *Condition* of that *Jus* or *Debitum*. And that is, 1. The *Condition* of our *first right*. 2. Or of our *continued right*. 3. The Constitution *de Debito mali pœnæ*, is *ever conditional*, i.e. *propter culpam*: And though the word *Condition* is commonly used *in bonam partem*, as a member of *Promises* and *Contracts*, yet is it truly and properly also used *in malam partem*, as a member of the Threatning.

Prop. 3. All the Doctrines, Narratives, Historical and Prophetical found in Scripture, are *Adjuncts* of God's Law in the strictest sense; and *parts* of it in a *larger sense*; yea, they are *signa Constituentia Debitum*, and so true parts of Law strictly taken in their *Remote* use, though in their *neareſt* use they are but *Adjuncts*; even as Narratives of the matter and occasion, are in many Statute-Laws of this Land.

Prop. 4. All the *generical essence* of a Law, is found in each *individual*; and there needeth no *other form*, but mere *matter* for the reception of that *general nature*, to make an individual Law.

Prop. 5. The Specification of Laws therefore, is not so proper as the Specification of Substantial Beings, but a Moral, less proper Specification.

Prop.

Prop. 6. Laws may be ſaid ſpecifically to differ, and be diſtinguiſhed theſe ways: 1. From the *ſpecial end*; eſpecially when the ends are much diſtant or deſtructive of each other. 2. From the very *matter*, when the difference is very great, and ſo from the *Condition* of *Premiant* or *Penal* acts. 3. From *Divers Efficients*, i. e. *Legiſlators*, or the divers grounds of Legiſlative right, and ſo of Legiſlation. 4. From the *ſignifying matter*; and ſo ſome are written, ſome verbal, *&c.* 5. From the ſtate of the *ſubject* to whom the Laws are given. 6. From the number of parts: So ſome are only Precepts, ſome are only for reward upon duty, ſome only for diviſion of Inheritance, or Conſtitution of particular Rights without Conditions. Some have all the forementioned parts, Preceptive, Penal and Premiant: For they are not eſſential parts of a *Law in Genere*, but only of *ſome Laws in ſpecie*, from the *order* of *effecting*. Some are made immediately by the Sovereign Power; ſome the Sovereign makes mediately, by giving power to others to make them; as Under-Laws of Corporations, *&c.* ſo from the manner of the Sanction, as remediable, or remedileſs, Reward and Penalty.

Pro. 7. The word [*Law*] agreeth properly to all the parts of God's Law, taken ſingly; not only to the Precept and Commination, but alſo the *Promiſe*: Yea, it is as properly called a Law as a *Covenant*; becauſe a Law doth but *Jus Conſtituere & Obligare ſubditum*; but a Covenant is a *ſelf-obliging*, and a making a duty to our ſelves, and ſo putting a Law upon our ſelves. Now in the moſt ſtrict ſenſe, God can-

cannot be said to be *obliged*, (as *Durandus* and others shew:) But in that the perfect Goodness, Veracity, Fidelity and Immutability of God doth ascertain to us the thing promised; therefore, after the manner of men, we may say, that God by his Word doth *oblige himself*, who yet strictly cannot be a Debtor: And thus God is said to *Covenant*.

Prop. 8. This same act of *Promise* is called a *Law* and a *Covenant* in several respects. It's called a *Law*, in that it is the *act of a Rector*, performed to the *ends of Government*, imposing on us the act of consenting, and annexing a reward and penalty.

Thus it is *Lex stricta dicta*. It is called a Covenant, partly as God doth, as it were, engage himself: (And so the mere Promise is a *simple* Covenant) partly as he requireth *man's Promise or Consent* to the terms (and so it is a *propounded* or *tendered* Covenant-mutual;) and partly as man doth *actually repromise* and engage himself to God, and accept the terms of God's Covenant: (And so it is an actual, mutual Covenant or Contract.) But it is called *Jus Constituens*, a Law in the general sense, as it is the *Constitution* of *Right* howsoever.

Prop. 9. Though the true nature of a Law be found in each of the formentioned acts singly, yet it is the *preceptive* Act that is most *eminently* so called, especially as (disjunctively) taking in the *Penal Act* with it, explicitely or implicitely. And so the great and eminent work of Laws is *obligare aut ad Obedientiam aut ad pœnam*, and the *premiant* Act is not of such constant use and necessity.

Prop. 10. The word [Law] therefore is more comprehenſive than the word [*Covenant*] ſtrictly taken; the former, being properly uſed as of every ſingle act fore-mentioned; the latter only of the *Promiſe*. Yet is the whole Law ſometimes called a *Covenant* from the *Promiſe*, which is a noble part of it; but that is an improper Appellation, as calling the whole by the name of a part: But the other is more proper, as calling the whole and each part by the name of that general Eſſence which doth inform each part, and the whole. Properly therefore God's Covenants are his Laws (unleſs when the name *Covenant* is improperly uſed of mere Predictions, and then Remotely and Reductively they are *Laws*) but all *God's Law* is not a Covenant.

Prop. 11. According to the forementioned ways of Specification, God's Laws may be thus ſpecified and diſtributed: 1. As from the *ſpecial ends*. And ſo God's Laws are either, 1. For the obliging the Subject to *perfect obedience*; or for the *recovering and reſtoring* him from his revolt, and from his miſery. The former is alſo, 1. As obliging to obedience *every way perfect*: This was the Law given to *Adam in Innocency, and it doth not ſo oblige us now*: ☞ For it cannot *obligare ad præteritum*, and to *duty*, ſo far as Penalty is ſuffered for former *non*-performance. 2. Or as obliging to *perfect obedience only for the future*, as ſuppoſing former ſin: ☞ And ſo it is the *general Law of God*, and that *Law of Nature* which ſtill remains in force to ſaln Mankind, obliging him ſtill to obey or ſuffer.

2. The

2. The *recovering Law* is specified both, 1. As it *restoreth* rebelling Apostatizing man *to God and his obedience*, 1. *Inchoatively, by Repentance and Faith.* 2. *Progressively*, by *sincere Obedience*, through Sanctification. 3. *Perfectly, in Glory.* And 2. As it restoreth undone, lost, *condemned man* from his *misery*, 1. *Relatively*, by *Gift.* 2. *Really*, as in the three fore-mentioned degrees. For that which brings us to God, (to Obedience, as the means to please him as the end) doth thereby restore us from our *own Misery.*

3. God's Laws are specified from their *matter*, thus:

1. As to the *Precept:* God hath a Law (or had) whose matter was *perfect Obedience* (as before-described:) And he hath a Law, whose matter is *Repentance* for *Imperfection*, *Faith* in him that *restoreth* us from sin, and *sincere Obedience* for the *future* to God-Redeemer.

2. As from the matter of the *Promissory* part: So God had a Law made to *Adam*, which (as Divines do think, and it is very probable) did promise *Adam* not only Immunity from God's Wrath, Death, *&c.* but also a *Celestial Glory* afterward, in case of his perfect Obedience. God hath now a Law, by which he promiseth to *give Christ himself* to be our *Head*, *Husband*, *and Lord*, *and Saviour*, and with him *Remission*, *Adoption*, *Justification*, the *Spirit* of the Redeemer, and a *Glorification* with our Head, where we shall for ever praise him that hath redeemed us to God by his Blood, and made us Kings and Priests to God; and in order thereto, that he will by degrees take off our sin by Sanctification, and our penal misery by Preservations,

Deliverances, Conſolations, and at laſt by the Reſurrection and final Abſolution. Theſe things were not the matter of the firſt Promiſe.

3. As to the *Threatning*, (though ſome ſay that the *New-Law* hath *no threatning*: yet) 1. God's Law *purely Moral*, 1. Did threaten to man in Innocency, *Death* in *general*, which contained the loſs of God's Favour and Spirit, and of his preſent felicity, and his hopes of what was promiſed for the future; together with the pains and diſſolution of his body, and everlaſting pains (at leaſt) to his Soul: Which pain would much conſiſt in the gripes of Conſcience for his not-continuing his Innocency, and in the ſenſe of his miſery in the foreſaid Loſs. 2. The ſame Law of *Nature*, called *Moral*, as ſtill *continued to faln man*, doth *threaten* upon every further Tranſgreſſion, the *increaſe* of our foreſaid miſery (ſo far as we are capable ſubjects;) and doth by *more renewed Obligations*, bind on us the ſame.

2. God hath beſides this, his ſpecial Law of Grace, which *threateneth more* than the Law did to *Adam*, or as merely natural it doth to any: (I mean as it is made to man as man, and for obedience as ſuch, and not as it is made to man as *redeemed* for *Recovery and Reſtoration*:) that is, This *New-Law* threatneth the *loſs* and *privation* of all *that good*, which we before mentioned, as the *matter* of its promiſe; as the loſs of *Chriſt himſelf*, that he ſhall be no Head, Husband, or effectual Saviour to us; nor be our Advocate with God to juſtifie us, nor intercede for our Salvation: We ſhall loſe all the *hopes* we had of God's favour, as to be reſtored by him, and of the Remiſſion of our ſins, and of Juſtification and Adoption, and of the ſanctifying

Spirit

pirit, and all the Conſolations of God, the joy and peace in believing, the deliverance from the Captivity of Satan, and from the dominion of ſin, the right by promiſe to the bleſſings of this Life, and to eternal Glory, as purchaſed and reſtored, and of final Abſolution in Judgment. The pain of *ſenſe* alſo is much more than the *firſt* Law did threaten: For as in *general* it will be a *far ſorer puniſhment*, ſo *ſpecially* it will be inflicted for *ingratitude* againſt the *Redeemer*; and it will much conſiſt, 1. In the ſenſe of the greatneſs of the fore-mentioned loſs. 2. In the gripes of Conſcience for their ingratitude, and wilful neglecting and rejecting of ſo great and free a Salvation.

And whereas ſome ſay, *It is no Privation, and conſequently no puniſhment, to loſe that which they never had.*

I anſwer, It is very falſe: If they had but an *offer* of it and *conditional Promiſe* (ſpecially ſo free and ſure a one) and were put into a *poſſibility* of it, and a way to attain it, ſo that their own refuſal only depriveth them of it (or their Impenitency and Ingratitude) this is properly a Privation and a Penalty: Though it's true, according to their Doctrine that deny Chriſt's general Satisfaction, and that he purchaſed to all men a poſſibility of recovery, it would be no puniſhment to miſs of it, as being but a *Negation*, and no *Privation*.

4. Alſo and moſt principally from the *matter* of the ſeveral *Conditions* of the penal and premiant Acts, are God's Laws ſpecified and diſtinguiſhed. The *Condition* of the firſt Threatning, was the *leaſt particular* ſin; the Condition of the Threatning of the New-Law, is only *final Impenitency, Infidelity*,

fidelity and *Rebellion* againſt the Lord that bought us, in reſpect to the penalty of everlaſting wrath and death: But leſſer ſins are oft puniſhed with ſome withdrawings of the Spirit of Grace, and ſome ſenſe of God's diſpleaſure, and temporal afflictions. The Condition of the Promiſe of the firſt Law was perfect obedience, without the leaſt ſin: This is now ceaſed (though Mr. *C.* deny it); for, 1. The matter of the Condition now would be *naturaliter impoſſibile*: man having once ſinned, it is *impoſſible* he ſhould be perfect, and that which is done, ſhould again be undone. It is therefore an intolerable conceit for us to conceive, that God offers life to ſinners, on condition that they be not ſinners; and that he hath a Covenant in this form, [*If thou have not ſinned in* Adam, *thou ſhalt live.*] God's Promiſes run not upon terms of natural impoſſibility: For ſuch a Promiſe is indeed a *Threatening* or *Sentence*, and no Promiſe, and is equivalent in Law-ſenſe to this; [*Becauſe thou haſt ſinned in* Adam, *thou art guilty of Death.*] 2. The Conditions of the Promiſes are *future* or *preſent* uſually, and not ſomewhat paſt; at leaſt, where *Duty* is the matter of the Condition, as here it is. And when the time of the Condition is expired (as it is when it is become naturally impoſſible) the Promiſe ceaſeth. 3. God is, as it were, obliged by his Promiſe, while it is in force: But when the Condition is abſolutely violated, God can no longer ſtand obliged. Our Covenant-breaking diſobligeth him. 4. *Ceſſante naturali ſubjecti capacitate ceſſat promiſſio*: But the *capacity* of *all* Mankind is ceaſed of receiving the benefit of the firſt Covenant on its terms; therefore, *&c.*

Mr.

Mr. *C.* saith, *This would as well prove, that the Precept ceaseth, because man is uncapable of obeying it.*

I answer, 1. A man loseth *Benefits* by his *own fault*, but no man must be freed from *Duty* or *Penalty* by his *own fault*. *Nemo ex proprio crimine commodum recipit*, we may lose our *own right* by our sin, but God loseth not his. 2. The Law *doth cease* to oblige us to *Obedience absolutely perfect*: It doth not command usnow that we shall *not be guilty of* Adam's *sin*. 3. But for the *time to come*, Obedience is not *naturaliter impossibile*, but only *moraliter per accidens ex prava dispositione*, which *aggravates* sin, but excuseth not from duty: But our capacity of the *Reward*, on the terms of that Covenant, is as *naturally impossible*, as it is for contradictory Propositions to be both true, [*Peccavimus in* Adamo,] and, [*Non peccavimus in* Adamo.]

Mr. *C.* objecteth, That *it may seem unreasonable that the Promise ceast, and the Threat be in force.*

I answer, The contrary is true: Nothing more *reasonable*, than that man's sin should forfeit his *own right*, and disoblige God, without forfeiting *God's right*, and disobliging themselves. So much of the Condition of the Promise of the first Law.

Now I add for Comparison: The Condition of the Covenant, or Promise of the Law of Grace, is *Faith*, *Repentance*, *and new Obedience*, which much differs from the *former Condition*. Of this more fully anon. So much of the Specification of God's Laws by the Conditions, the Promise and Threat; and so of the Specification of them from the matter of each part.

3. God's Laws are ſpecified from the *divers Relations* of the Legiſlator, and the divers rights of Government: And ſo God's firſt Law of Nature was made by him as *Creator*, or as *Rector ex jure Creationis:* But his Law of Grace is made by him as *Redeemer*, or as *Rector ex jure Redemptionis.* Here I might eaſily ſhew a multitude of miſchievous errours that follow the denying univerſal Redemption *quoad pretium & ſatisfactionem:* But I paſs them. Eſpecially note here theſe three things following: 1. That the *jus Redemptionis* doth not deſtroy the the former *jus Creationis*; but ſuppoſing it is ſuperadded to it, and ſomewhat ſubordinate. 2. That therefore the Law of God, as *Creator* is not deſtroyed or abrogated by the Law of the *Redeemer*, but is ſuperadded, and that in a certain Subordination to it. 3. That yet the ſaid Law of *Creation* ſtands not now alone (as God's right of Creation to the Government ſtands not alone, but conjunct with his right of Redemption:) And therefore, 1. The *Threatening* is not now *remedileſs* as then it was, but conjunct with, and potentially or virtually deſtroyed by the remedying Law. 2. And therefore the *Precept* is not now to the ſame *ends only*, or *wholly* as before the fall: The *immediate end* indeed is the *ſame*, that is, that man be obliged to Duty to his Creator; but remotely there is this change, the end is not now to retain perfect man in his perfection, nor to keep him from falling from his firſt felicity, or forfeiting his right to the benefit of that Covenant: And the immediate remaining end, remaineth not alone: For the Law of Nature is not now only to oblige us to obey the Creator, but alſo the Redeemer: And it is alſo to

be

be the Rule of our ſincere Obedience, which is the Condition of our Salvation: So that now the Law of Nature (or the Moral Law) is the Law of God as Creator and Redeemer both: For all things are delivered into the hands of Chriſt, and therefore the Laws. As if the Subjects and Laws of a Nation of pardoned Rebels, ſhould by the King be delivered to his Son as their Governor, having procured their pardon: So that there are no Laws in the World now but the Redeemers Laws. But yet we muſt ſtill obſerve a wide difference between his Law of Grace, which is proper to *God-Redeemer* as Redeemer; and this remnant of the Law of Nature, *which the Redeemer found the ſinner under when he redeemed him*, and which was with the ſinner delivered up to him, partly ſtill to oblige the ſinner to duty, partly to oblige him to puniſhment, that ſo he might be a fit ſubject for the Law of Redemption, whoſe very nature is to be a *remedying Law*, to diſſolve the obligation of the former.

4. God's Laws alſo are ſpecified, or at leaſt diverſified by the different *matter* of the *ſign*. And ſo ſome Laws of God conſiſt in his Revelations by the mere *Works of Nature, within us, and without us*, in which we may read much of God's mind; the inviſible things of God being ſeen in the things that are made, ſo far as to leave men without excuſe. This is now commonly called the *Law of Nature*: Other Laws God hath revealed by Works indeed, but it is *ſupernatural Works*: And ſo Chriſt's Life, Miracles, Death, Reſurrection, giving the Spirit, were a real Law to the World that could know them: For they were ſigns of God's Will *de Debito Credendi*, &c. Other Laws God hath revealed by

by word of mouth, others by Inſpiration, others by Writing; which are now his principal ſtanding Laws, adjoyning to that of Nature (and containing its matter.)

5. God's Laws are divers, according to the divers ſtates of the ſubject. And ſo God's firſt Law was to *innocent Man* in his *Friendſhip*, and in ſome felicity. God's *remedying* Law of Grace (yea, and his remnant of the pure Morals) is made to *man faln*: But with this difference; The *Morals as ſuch*, remain to oblige man *qui peccator*, not only *quà peccator*. But the Law of *Grace* is to oblige, and to recover a ſinner *quà peccator Redemptus & Reſtaurandus eſt*. And as Laws of men are diſtinguiſhed, ſome being for defending the *juſt*, ſome for puniſhing the *unjuſt*; ſome for *loyal* Subjects, ſome for thoſe that have been diſloyal, &c. ſo may we ſay of God's Laws. But the differing ends here included are more conſiderable.

6. So from the *number* of *Parts*, or the ſeveral *Rights* conſtituted, are God's Laws diſtinguiſhed. Some conſtitute only the *dueneſs* of *Duty* or *Penalty*: (as the remnant of the Law of *Nature*, or pure Morals, which loſt the adjoyned Promiſe, and ſo ſtood alone to *Adam* before the Promiſe was made: I ſay *alone*, though not without mercy and poſſibility of remedy, yet without any *Promiſe* of a remedy revealed.) Other Laws of God have Precept, Promiſe and Threatning, as is aforeſaid.

7. Some Laws are of God's own *immediate* enacting, though he may uſe a Scribe to cauſe the *ſign*, or a Herald to *promulgate* them, yet no ones *Will* enterpoſeth to give them a *Being*: Such are the Laws of *Nature and Scripture*. Other Laws of God are ſo

ſo his, as that *immediately* they are the *Laws of men:* Such are all Laws of Common-wealths and Churches, which are not againſt God's ſpecial Laws, but according to their general Determinations and Directions: Which are all only as Under-Laws, to be made and altered *pro re nata*; which it was not fit ſhould be determined a-like to all Ages and Nations by one univerſal, ſtanding Law; nor yet did God think fit to be called down to every alteration, ſo as to be the viſible Governour of each Church and Commonwealth: And therefore he hath entruſted a certain Legiſlative power for ſuch under-Laws in the hand of his Officers; and what they do, according to his Commiſſion, he owneth and maketh it his own Laws; and ſo commandeth us in the Fifth Commandment to obey them.

8. Laſtly, God's Laws are much differenced from the *manner* of the *Sanction*. And ſo the *Threatning* of his *firſt Law*, though it *ſhewed no remedy*, yet it *excluded not all poſſibility* of remedy nor was a *peremptory undiſſolvable* Obligation: Much leſs is the *remaining* part of it ſo now, when the Covenant of Grace is made. But the *Threatning* of the *Law of Grace*, to the *final non-performers* of the *Conditions* of that Covenant, is a *peremptory Threatning*, and its Obligation is *remedileſs and undiſſolvable*. This is becauſe God hath adjoyned to it a *Prediction*, that there ſhall be no more Sacrifice for ſin, nor remedy, nor eſcape. Thus much of the ſeveral Specifications or Diſtributions of God's Laws.

Here note theſe two things:

1. That I have not inſtanced all this while, in the Law of the Jews Church or Common-wealth as ſuch,

ſuch, becauſe the Explication of it hath ſuch difficulties, that cannot thus *obiter* and curſorily be opened.

2. From what is ſaid it may appear, that the firſt and moſt eminent diſtribution of God's Laws, as ſtanding at the greateſt difference, is between that made to *Adam in Innocency*, and that made by the *Redeemer for our Recovery*. For in almoſt all the forementioned reſpects are they differenced, as I have ſhewed already. And the ſecond moſt eminent diſtribution of God's univerſal Laws, is into the remnant of the *Law of Nature*, Creation, or pure Morals, as now put into the hand of the Redeemer; and the proper *Law of the Redeemer* being *Lex remedians*, a Law of Grace.

Note alſo, That becauſe the *Covenant* or *Promiſory* part is the *principal* part of *this Law*, it being purpoſely a *remedying Law*, an Act of Oblivion, therefore it is more commonly called the *Covenant* than the *Law*, and more commonly and properly called the *Promiſe* than the *Covenant*; and frequently alſo (or ſometime) a *Teſtament* (though ſome deny it;) and oft a *Conſtitution*, *Diſpoſition*, *Ordination*, which is a *Law*, and oft and properly alſo called a *Law*. But the Law of *Works* with *Adam*, was principally contained in the *Precept* and *Comimination*; inſomuch, as it ſeemeth a very hard Controverſie with ſome, Whether there were *any Covenant* or Promiſe at all or no. There is none found written, unleſs implied in the Threat; and that is hard to be concluded, ſeing every threat of death implieth not a promiſe of everlaſting life: And whether it were contained in *nature or no*, is hard to ſay.

Faræus

Paræus in Proem. ad Comment. in Rom. denieth that there is *any Covenant of Nature*, but only of *Grace*; and ſaith, *God cannot naturally* be obliged to the Creature. Others think, that though in point of *Commutative Juſtice* he could not, yet as *Rector ob ſines Regiminis ſecundum Juſtitiam diſtributivam*, he was *quaſi obligatus*, to reward man perfectly obeying, though *how far* they dare not ſay. Theſe things are left very dark, or at leaſt, we ſee little of them. But (though it be probable by ſome paſſages in the Goſpel, and ſomewhat in Reaſon, that *Adam* had a *Promiſe* not only of continuing in that felicity, but of a *greater*; yet) I never read, to my remembrance, the name of *Covenant* or *Promiſe* uſed of that Law to *Adam*.

The third moſt obſervable diſtribution of God's Laws, is between the Law given by *Moſes* to the *Church and Common-wealth* of the Jews, and the *Promiſe* or *Law of Grace* by *Jeſus Chriſt*. The differences I will not now adventure on; only I ſhall ſay theſe three things: 1. That one was but particular to one people, the other univerſal: 2. That among the Jews, this was by an excellency called *the Law*, ſo that they in a manner appropriated that term to it, as if they knew no other Law. 3. That therefore in *Paul*'s Epiſtles it is this *Judicial Law* that is commonly called [*The Law*,] and which he diſputeth againſt directly and expreſly in the Doctrine of Juſtification, and whoſe Abrogation he ſo contends for, and which he ſets againſt the Law of Faith, and the Grace and Truth that came by Jeſus Chriſt. If this be not obſerved, the Scripture, eſpecially *Paul*'s Epiſtles, will not be underſtood.

The

The fourth moſt obſervable difference between God's Laws, is between the *Law of Grace*, or the *Promiſe* as *before Chriſt* and the ſame as *after Chriſt*. This difference, though very great, yet is *moſtly* but accidental in the Promulgation. At firſt it was revealed more obſcurely, and after more clearly: At firſt eminently to *one Nation*, and after *univerſally* to the Catholick Church (and for the gathering of it firſt:) So that the term [*Goſpel*] is appropriate to that Publication, which was *after Chriſt*; and the *former* called only the *Promiſe*. Yet *ſome* difference *more* than *accidental* here is between theſe two: For, 1. They *before Chriſt*, were bound to believe only *in a Meſſiah* in general; we are bound to believe that *Jeſus Chriſt is he*, or we ſhall die in our ſins: They were to believe in him as *to come*; we, *as come already*: A more general dark Belief would ſave them; it was not ſo neceſſary to Salvation to know his *Death*, and *Reſurrection*, and *Aſcenſion*, and *coming again to Judgment*; (for ſure the Diſciples were in a ſtate of Salvation, when they knew not theſe:) But now all theſe are neceſſary to Salvation to be known. 2. The *matter* of their *Obedience* to the Redeemer, was not then the ſame as now: Then they muſt ſhew ſincere Obedience partly in obſerving the *Jewiſh Law*; but now not ſo: Nay, we have Sacraments newly inſtituted, and Churches otherwiſe ordered, *&c.* 3. More of the Spirit and Grace was poured out after Chriſt than before; inſomuch, as that eminent degree hath the name of [*the Spirit*] oft appropriated to it: And ſo it is ſaid, the Diſciples had not yet received the Spirit, becauſe Chriſt was not yet glorified: And it is called the Spirit of Promiſe, that is the promiſed Spirit.

Spirit. So much for the Diſtribution of God's Laws.

Prop. 12. The nature or uſe of a *Law*, is to be the rule of our actions, and of God's Judgment: *Regula actionum Moralium, & norma judicii*, becauſe it conſtituteth what is due both *from us*, and *to us*.

Prop. 13. Whatever Law therefore is in force for us to *live by*, we muſt neceſſarily be *judged* by it: And whatever Law we are *judged* by, we muſt either be *juſtified* or *condemned* by: For *judging* is the *genus*, which exiſteth not but in theſe *ſpecies* of *Abſolution* and *Condemnation*.

Prop. 14. To *juſtifie* or *condemn* a man according to the Law, as the rule of Judgment is to *judg* that the *reward* is *due*, or *not due*; or the *puniſhment due*, or *not due* to him, according to the tenor of that Law; that is, that he is *guilty*, or *not guilty*, when he is charged with a fault, and to have no right to the reward, or to be liable to the penalty, becauſe of his fault.

Prop. 15. To be *guiltleſs*, is to be *juſt in ſenſu forenſi* againſt *theſe Accuſations*: To be one, 1. That is faultleſs; 2. Or to whom the benefit or *reward* is due, or to whom the penalty is *not due* according to that Law, this is to be *juſt*.

Prop. 16. He that is *thus juſt*, is *therefore juſtified*, *becauſe* he is *juſt*: For the *juſtitia Cauſæ, & ita perſonæ quoad hanc cauſam*, is it which is to be enquired

enquired after as the buſineſs of the day: And it is the Office of the *juſt Judg*, to *juſtifie* the *juſt qua talis*, *becauſe* they *are juſt*; and *condemn* the *unjuſt*, *becauſe* they are *unjuſt*. For to *juſtifie*, is but to *ſentence* him *juſt*; that is, *juſt*, *becauſe he is juſt*. It is therefore impoſſible for any man to have *juſtitiam cauſæ*, a *juſt Cauſe*, or Righteouſneſs of his Cauſe at God's Bar, and yet not to be *juſtified by it*.

Prop. 17. Yet that which is the *cauſe* of Juſtification in *ſenſu forenſi*, is not always a *proper cauſe in a Phyſical ſenſe*; but ſometime only an Antecedent, or *Diſpoſitio materiæ*, or *Cauſa ſine qua non*: The Cauſe that is to be tried.

Prop. 18. Though *mediately* (*quod ad reatum culpæ*) it be the Precept that will be the rule to judg men juſt or unjuſt by, yet ultimately it is the *penal* or *premiant* act of the Law, the *Promiſe* or the *Threatning*, which is it that concludeth men *juſt* or *unjuſt*, and is the immediate rule of juſtifying or condemning them, and not the Precept or Prohibition. Theſe do but determine *de Debito Officii*, or what was or ſhall be *due from us to God*; but the final buſineſs of the Judgment, is to determine what is *due from God* to us: And this is conſtituted in the Promiſe and the Threatning only.

Prop. 19. It is therefore the *Condition* of that *Promiſe* or *Threatning*, that will be the very thing by which we muſt be tried: (For the *Condition* is *part* of the *Promiſe* which is *conditional*.) And the Queſtion of the day will be, *Whether we did perform that Condition of the Promiſe or not?* and ſo, Whether

Whether the *Condition* of the Threatning be found upon us or not.

Prop. 20. That which is our performance of the Condition of the Promiſe, and not committing the Condition of the Threat, is therefore our *Material Righteouſneſs*, by which we are juſtified in that Judgment againſt the Accuſation of non-performance.

Prop. 21. As there was a *Two-fold Law entire*, conſiſting of Precepts, Threatning, and Promiſe, (or at leaſt the two firſt, by the conſent of all, were in the Firſt Law) made upon a double ground of Legiſlation, to a different End, a different Subject, *&c.* ſo is there a *Two-fold Judgment*, and ſo a *Two-fold Juſtification* and *Condemnation:* One by God as *Rector*, according to the pure *Law of Works*, as *Creator:* The other by God in *Chriſt* as *Redeemer* and *Rector* of the *Redeemed World*, upon the terms, and by the Law of Grace. The Judgment of God-Creator, according to the Law of Works, hath two parts and ſeaſons, according as that Law doth much differ as it ſtood entirely in Innocency, and without Remedy, till the promiſe of Grace; and as it ſtands in part, and with that Redeeming Promiſe ſince.

1. The firſt Judgment that God held, was after the Fall of *Adam*, when as *Creator* according to that firſt Law, he ſat upon the Offendors, and *paſſed the Sentence of Condemnation on all Mankind*: but before the *Execution*, yea even *in the Judgment*, the *Mediator* as it were *interpoſing*; that is, God in mercy reſolving upon, and promiſing a way for

the reſcuing of the Offendor by the Satisfaction of his Juſtice; he look'd upon that Satisfaction and Sacrifice as *in eſſe morali*; and upon conſideration of it as future, he paſt a Sentence of *Conditional Abſolution* and *Pardon*, in a *Promiſe* of the Meſſias to bruiſe the Serpent. But this was but ſomewhat obſcurely done: Hereupon he preſcribed typifying Bloody Sacrifices as the Conditions in part, and as further teaching intimations of the promiſed Sacrifice. He accepted the Bloody Sacrifice of *Abel* ſincerely offered in Faith; and he rejected the Unbloody Sacrifice of *Cain* offered without Faith and ſincerity; and told him, [*If thou do well*, (that is, according to the *New-Law* alſo) *ſhalt thou not be accepted?* (*viz.* through the promiſed Seed and Sacrifice); *but if thou do ill, ſin lieth at the door*]: expounding the Covenant of Grace more fully, as being *Conditional*, and *Faith* and *ſincere Obedience* being the *Conditions*: which it is moſt likely God fullier expounded then to the Patriarks, than is left written. This Covenant God yet made plainer to *Noah*, and yet much plainer to *Abraham*, and to the *Iſraelites* in Types; and yet much plainer by the Prophets, eſpecially *David* and *Iſaiah*. Thus God did firſt, by his own actual Sentence or Promiſe, and then by the ſame revealed fullier by Prophets and Laws, *conditionally juſtifie* the fallen World, and *abſolve* them from their guilt.

But becauſe the Sacrifice offered, and Satisfaction performed, was more than the ſame as merely promiſed and undertaken; therefore God reſerved the fuller Declaration of that *Abſolution*, which is the Fruit of it, till the Meſſiah ſhould come. And then God did again more fully pronounce the Sentence

of

of *Conditional Absolution*, twice, or two ways: First, He did by a Voice from Heaven pronounce, [*This is my Beloved Son, in whom I am well-pleased, hear ye him*]; *q. d.* [According to his undertaking he is Incarnate, and is now satisfying my Justice, and doth all that I require at his hands for Man's Redemption. This is he in whom my Wrath is appeased to the World, (not absolutely to acquit them, but) so far that if they will *Hear him*, they shall live]. Next this, The Lord Jesus himself having taken fuller possession of his Dominion and Empire, doth most clearly publish the New-Law of Grace: That, [*Whoever doth Repent and Believe, shall be pardoned and saved*, &c.] This Law is an *Act of Pardon*: And being so oft spoken by God himself, and now by Christ in the flesh, it is equivalent to a General *Sentence of Judgment*. Not as Absolutely and Actually pardoning *particular* Sinners: for so it is but a Law of Grace, or a Promise of it on Condition: But as it is the solemn Pronunciation of a General and *Conditional Absolution* to all Mankind, so it is a kind of Sentence, or equivalent thereto. And thus God the Father as *Rector*, according to the Law of Works, hath himself, by an Act of Grace, *Justified Conditionally* the *fore-condemned World*. And this *Conditional Justification* is not to be sleighted, because but *Conditional*, and because that many afterwards perish: For it is a *pure free Gift*; and the Condition is but the *accepting* of *the Gift according to its Nature*, *viz.* *Christ* and *Life*: And *Acceptance* is so *naturally supposed necessary* in all *Gifts*, that it is not used to be *expressed* as a *Civil Condition*, but *implyed* among rational Men; and the Gift called *Absolute*, (though

indeed ſo far Conditional); And Refuſal and Ingratitude uſeth to deprive Men of thoſe Gifts which the Laws of Men call *Abſolute*.

Beſides, it belongeth not to *God as Legiſlator*, to give Men *Hearts* to *accept his Gift* (but in another Relation): And he *gives* Chriſt, and Pardon, and Right to Life, as *Legiſlator* and *Rector ſecundum Leges*, and as *Benefactor* together. And therefore God doth *quantum in ſe* as *Legiſlator*, *juſtifie all Men*.

In the firſt Juſtification of the *Father*, or *God-Creator*, (I mean by him *as Judg*), the *ſole Condition*, and ſo the *ſole Righteouſneſs* of the *Juſtified World*, is the *Sacrifice* and *Merit* of the *Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, who is therefore called the *Lord our Righteouſneſs*. No Act or Habit of Man's, either *Faith* or *Works*, is any *Condition* of this *firſt Juſtification*. Thus was *God in Chriſt reconciling the World unto himſelf, not imputing to them their tranſgreſſions*. Thus have *we Redemption in his Blood, even the Remiſſion of ſins*: Thus *having purged* (or *made purgation* of) *our ſins by himſelf, he aſcended and ſat at the Right Hand of God*, Heb. 1. 3. Here *Chriſt* the *Redeemer* was not the *Judg*, but was *judged*, and *loco delinquentis & rei*: *God the Father* here was *Judg*, who *firſt condemned* his Son, as it were; and after *Satisfaction* given, *juſtified firſt him* as *Sponſor*, and then the *World* for his ſake. Thus God *forgave thoſe all the Debt*, who yet periſh by taking their fellow-Servant by the *Throat*. Remember that we diſclaim all Man's *Works* or *Faith*, as not being the leaſt part of, or Ingredient in, *This General Conditional Juſtification of fallen Mankind, by an Act of Pardon equivalent to a Sentence*.

But

But seeing it was never in the thoughts of the Father or Mediator to make us *Gods*, and exempt us from his Government; therefore *a Lord* we must still have, and therefore *a Law*: and he was pleased by *a Law* to *make* the *foresaid Justification*, and *convey* to us our *Right* in Christ and his Benefits. And *this Law* imposeth on us *Duty* to the *Lord-Redeemer*, and constituteth the *Conditions* on which we shall live by him, and so is of use for the Application of his Benefits; and according to this *New-Law* the *Redeemer* that hath bought us, doth *here govern us*; therefore according to *this Law* will *he judg* us.. So that the Great Judgment at the Last Day, will be by *Christ as Redeemer*, (and God the Father in and by him) and so by the *Redeemer's Law*.

I will not dare to determine that there will then be no use of the Law of Works as a Rule of Judgment, (but none as the *Only Rule* to any); or that there will be no justifying Men from the Guilt of Death as due, according to the Sentence of that first Law.

But these things I may say, 1. That if there be any *Accusation* of Men *merely as sinners*, and as guilty of Death by the *first Law*, then must there be at Judgment a double *Justification* requisite against a *double Accusation*. One is against the *true Accusation*, that is, we *sinned* against the *Law of Works*, and thereby deserved the *Penalty*. Against this (confessing our sins) we plead, The *Blood of Christ procuring us pardon*, and that Pardon as *given* us *conditionally* in the *New-Covenant*. Then comes the *second Justification* to be necessary, in that here we are devolved over to the *New Covenant*, and to be tryed by the *Redeemer* and his *Law*: and

then the Queſtion is only, Whether we have performed the *Condition* of the *New-Covenant* or *not?* Againſt the *falſe Accuſations* [that we *have not*] we muſt be juſtified by our *Actual Performance*, as the *Matter* of our Righteouſneſs. This Juſtification is *ſubordinate* to the former; and by this the former is brought to perfection, and ſo we are *abſolutely juſtified.*

2. Note alſo; That the Scripture doth ſo much *ſuppoſe* our *Antecedent Conditional Juſtification* by *God-Creator* in the *Blood of Chriſt*, that it ſeemeth to deſcribe the *general Judgment*, as if that former were done already, and the latter only or mainly were apt to do, as the Work of that Day, as the means of making the firſt *abſolute.* For *Chriſt as Redeemer* ſhall be the *Judg*; and for *loving* or *not loving himſelf* in his *Members*, ſhall the *Sentence* paſs: not upon the mere terms of the Law of Works, but for improving or not-*improving* their Talents of Grace, I mean of Mercy received from the Redeemer. Here is therefore a *Particular Juſtification* from the *falſe Charge* of non-performance of the Goſpel-Conditions, neceſſary; and alſo a *General Juſtification* from the *guilt of all ſin* indeed committed, neceſſary, as the conjunct Grounds of the *total* and *final Univerſal Abſolution.* Which we may, according to the tenor of the Law, conceive of as in this order, (and ſo produceth alſo the Juſtification in our Conſciences, according to the Rule of the ſame Law).

First, The great Queſtion is, *Whether the Sinner is to be ſent to Heaven or to Hell? Saved or Damned?* The Accuſer ſaith, *He is to be damned.* (Here's the Accuſation *de fine*).

His

His firſt Accuſation, as the *Reaſon* is, [*Lord, he hath broke thy Law, which ſaith, The Soul that liveth ſhall die*]. The Juſtifier ſaith, [*I pardoned all Men for the ſake of the Blood of the Redeemer, on Condition of Faith and Repentance*]. (This part of the Judgment, that in the Goſpel-Deſcription ſeemeth to ſuppoſe as done).

The next Charge or Accuſation is, [*Lord, he did not truly believe and repent, and therefore hath no benefit by the Law of Grace:* (or elſe) *He added not ſincere Obedience, or did not perſevere, and therefore hath loſt his Right to thy Pardon*]. Againſt this we are juſtified by pleading *Not-guilty*; that is, That we did *Believe, Repent, Obey ſincerely*, and *Perſevere*. Upon which our Judg will determine, That according to the *Law of Grace* we are *Not-Guilty* in the Point we are Accuſed, and conſequently that *univerſally* we are not lyable to Condemnation.

By all this it appeareth that *Juſtification* being conſidered; 1. As oppoſite to *Accuſation*; 2. As oppoſite to *Condemnation*; That there is a *Two-fold Accuſation*, and conſequently a *Two-fold Juſtification* oppoſite thereto, and that there is a *Two-fold Condemnation* of the wicked *virtually* in Law: Alſo that there is one *final Peremptory Sentence* of Condemnation in Judgment, which ſhall paſs upon them upon this double Ground. And there is one *final Sentence* of *Life* for the Juſtification of Believers in Judgment; which paſſeth alſo on the double ground of the foreſaid double Juſtification, as oppoſite to Accuſation: of which the firſt only is Juſtification *a Reatu*, the ſecond, *Contra Reatum falſum impactum; vel quod rei non ſumus:* Theſe

are done in Law at our firſt Believing, from which time forward there is no Condemnation to them that are in Chriſt; but before they were in Chriſt by Faith, there was a Condemnation. Alſo that though there be *two Laws* that *Condemn*, yet there is but *one* that *Juſtifieth*; though that one hath a double juſtifying force, from the foreſaid double Accuſation; wherefore one is *à Condemnatione Legis veteris*; the other is *ne Condemnemur Lege novâ, vel in Judicio per Legem novam.* Which I make all plain thus.

1. The Law of *Works* condemneth Men as *ſinners*, (ſtill pardoned).

2. The Law of *Grace* condemneth them further as *ſuch* and *ſuch ſinners in ſpecie, viz.* as *final Rejecters of Chriſt.*

The firſt of theſe the Law of *Grace remitteth conditionally before Faith* (to all) *actually*, upon *Believing.* The laſt is *never remitted*, nor any juſtified from it.

I ſhewed before how there may be a double Accuſation in Judgment: one true, that we were to be condemned as Sinners: the other falſe, That we were to be condemned as Unbelievers, Rebels againſt Chriſt, or Apoſtates. We are juſtified from one by pleading Remiſſion, and from the other by pleading *Not-Guilty*; that is, our *perſonal Righteouſneſs, in tantum*, ſo far as that Charge extendeth. This is Juſtification by *Plea* or *Apologie*, whether by others or Chriſt as our Advocate: Upon which, as the Ground, or *Juſtitia Cauſæ*, follows the final abſolute ſentential Juſtification from the main charge (of being lyable to Damnation, and having no right to Salvation) by Chriſt as *Judg.*

Though

Though it may be ſaid alſo, That he juſtifieth in the foreſaid ſubordinate ſenſe, from the particular Accuſations, (of being condemnable as Sinners, and being Unbelievers, and being Condemnable as Unbelievers) as Judg, both as he concludeth of the diſtinct parts of the Sentence before the ſum or whole, and as he concludeth thoſe Parts and Premiſes in the whole: Firſt, Judging, [*He is not condemnable for ſin ſimply as againſt the Law of Works*]. Next, [*He is not guilty of final non-performance of the Conditions of the Law of Grace; therefore not condemnable for that, or by that Law*]: And then, [*Therefore he is not condemnable at all, but hath Right to Life*]. That I doubt not but God will make Man capable of a ſhorter diſpatch at that final Judgment, than we uſe to have at Humane Barrs, and therefore our Pleadings will not be ſo particular and expreſs. But yet as they will proceed on theſe Grounds, ſo this Order and theſe Reaſons of the Sentence will be made manifeſt to the World, how ſhort ſoever it be, and we ſhall be enabled to ſee the implyed Reaſon and Order, without particular dilatory Expreſſions.

By this it appeareth that it is impoſſible that a Creature can be under any Law, whoſe Office it is to be the *Rule of Actions* and *Judgment*; but he muſt be *judged*, and ſo either *Juſtified* or *Condemned* by that Law: which is expreſſed alſo in Scripture by our being *judged according to our Works*; that is, his performing or not-performing the Conditions of the premiant or penal Act of that Law. And to be *judged according to our Works*, is to be *juſtified or condemned according to our Works*: which *Works* muſt needs be *part* of the *Cauſe* to be then tryed;

tryed; and every *Cauſe* is *Juſt* or *Unjuſt*: and the juſtice of the *Cauſe*, is the juſtice of the *Perſon* as to that *Cauſe*: and a Man is therefore juſtified by the *Judg*, becauſe he is *juſt*, his *Cauſe being juſt*. And ſo is it no hard matter for a willing unprejudiced Mind, to ſee how Works do or do not juſtifie, though perhaps they may differ about the fitneſs of each others Notions and Expreſſions hereabouts.

I confeſs I think that thoſe plain vulgar Chriſtians, that never troubled their heads with the Notions of Divines, about which are moſt of our Controverſies, have as right, if not much righter apprehenſions of the Subſtance of this Doctrine of Juſtification than moſt others. And that very Speech, which the *Marrow of Modern Divinity* ſo blameth, as joyning our *own Righteouſneſs with Chriſt's*, to make up one entire Righteouſneſs, is yet in it ſelf no unfit Expreſſion, but apt to ſet forth the very ſcope of the Goſpel; and in the Mouth of a ſound Chriſtian it is ſound Divinity: I mean theſe vulgar words, [*We muſt do our beſt, and God will help us by his Grace, and forgive us wherein we fail*]: or, [*Chriſt by his Spirit cauſeth all the Regenerate to Believe, Repent, and ſincerely obey him to the death, and forgiveth all their ſins*]. This is plain Doctrine, which any honeſt Country-man may underſtand, though never ſo illiterate; and which is not only enough for Salvation, as to this Point, if ſoundly believed, but for ought I know, may be more than moſt Diſputers will ſuffer themſelves and others to know quietly, without contradicting it again by their Novelties. And I doubt not, if the word *Juſtification* be not known, or ever heard,

(which

(which yet I am far from desiring) yet while the Doctrine of *Remission of Sin*, and Right to Life, is known and believed, then is the same thing known in other words. And it's not inobservable, that the Apostle's Creed rather useth the term [*Forgiveness of sin*], which poor People better understand, and not the term [*Justification*], about which the Learned have filled the World with needless Quarrels.

Forgiveness of Sin is not the *whole Righteousness*. God never forgiveth *his sin*, that hath *nothing but sin*: He never made a grant of the forgiveness of all sins, without Exceptions, but only of the forgiveness of all upon *condition* of our performing the *Gospel-Conditions*: And the *Condition* is a plain *Exception* of the *non-performance* of it self, out of the Matter of the Pardon. Inherent Personal Righteousness is confessed by all Protestants and Christians. A Righteousness which makes not Righteous, so far, is a palpable Contradiction. To make Righteous, is to justifie *Constitutivè*. So far as any Man is *Constituted Just*, God will, 1. *Esteem* him, and *Accept* him as Just; 2. *Sentence* him Just; 3. And *use* him as Just in Execution. And Christ the Advocate will *maintain* him Just, if there be need or cause.

When the word [*Justification*] is taken only for *Remission of Sin*, and Right to Life, (or *judging* us such as have this) then it is a needless question to ask, Whether it consist materially in any Works or Actions of our own: Faith and Repentance can be but preparatory Conditions of it, and none of the Matter, only Christ's Righteousness meriteth it. If *Justification* be taken for *Making*, *Esteeming*,

Eſteeming, or *Sentencing* us Performers of the Goſpel-Conditions, then the matter of it is only in our own Hearts and Lives. If *Juſtification* be taken univerſally, it comprehendeth both the former. If taken for the final Sentence pronouncing us *non damnandos ſed glorificandos*, then it is grounded on the two former, (whereof one is ſubordinate to the other) as being *Cauſæ duplicis duplex Juſtitia.*

The Fifth Controverſie between us, is; *Whether the New-Law or Covenant have any Penalty conſtituted by it ſelf, or whether only the Law of Works do conſtitute penalty?*

To this I need to ſay no more than I have done already, becauſe his Opinion is grounded on the former, That there is but one Law; which overthrown, this falls with it.

Mr. *C*'s Error lyeth in his confounding *Legem in genere, Cum hâc Lege Operum in ſpecie.* A Law in general is a Determination or Conſtitution Authoritative *de jure*, and obligeth *ad Obedientiam aut ad Pœnam.* But Laws are ſeveral ways *ſpecified*, as is afore declared, and I will not repeat.

The Penalty proper to the New-Law, conſiſteth in theſe Particulars following.

1. To have no *part in Chriſt*, to be no Member of him, not united or eſpouſed to him, is one part of the Penalty, as it is *pœna damni:* Who will ſay that the Law of Works did threaten this? It would have been to *Adam* but a *Negation*, and no *Privation*, and ſo no Penalty.

2. The like may be ſaid of the *miſſing of Juſtification and Pardon* of all ſin; which is a part of the

the *pœna damni*, which the Law of Works knew not. Before the Law of Grace was enacted, and by Christ's Blood and the Promise, Remission was made possible; yea, conditionally given, it would have been no Penalty, though a misery, not to be forgiven.

3. The like may be said of the denyal of *Sanctifying Grace*, and the help of the Spirit to them that quench it.

4. And the hopelesness of their Condition that sin against the Holy Ghost.

5. And the non-liberation from eternal Torments.

6. But especially the *Peremptory Sentence* of Judgment, and Execution according. The Law of Works being violated, the Communication was dispensable on valuable Considerations, and the Obligation to Punishment dissolvable, and the Punishment it self removable: But the New-Law hath affixed a prediction to the Commination, making the said Commination indispensable, the Obligation undissolvable, and the Punishment certainly everlasting and remediless; not only (as the *first Law*) *providing no Remedy*, but decreeing that *none shall be provided* at all.

But I have mentioned these before, about the diversification of God's Laws, and there also mentioned a real difference in the *Pain* of *Sense*, between that which is threatned in the Law of Works, and of Grace. But if Mr. *C.* be resolved to confound these Sinners, and say God hath but *one Law*, looking only at the general nature of a Law, when he should look at the distinct *species*, then there's no Remedy.

6. Our

6. Our Sixth Controverſie is; *Whether the ſame thing which is the Condition of our Salvation* (as Mr. *C.* confeſſeth Obedience is) *be not alſo a Condition of our final ſentential Juſtification, and of our Right to Salvation* (though not of our *firſt Right*)? I affirm and he denies.

Our firſt Right to Salvation is given with our Juſtification or Pardon, upon our firſt believing: but our Obedience upon Opportunity is a Condition *non-amittendi*, or without which it ſhall not *continue*, nor ſhall we have ever *Jus in re.* This I proved I think ſufficiently in the Poſtſcript of my Papers to Mr. *C.* but he eaſily put by all, with the diſtinction of [*Right to Salvation*] and [*Salvation it ſelf*].

Before I conſider his *Exceptions*, I will add this Anſwer to his Diſtinction. 1. He yeeldeth the whole Cauſe in acknowledging, 1. That *Juſtification* and Right to Salvation have the ſame Conditions, (which he could not deny). 2. That Obedience is a Condition of Salvation. 3. For his Diſtinction is *ſine differentiâ*; there is no ſuch thing in the World, no nor poſſible, as a proper *Condition of Salvation*, diſtinct from a *Condition of Right to it.* Firſt, I hope, with any fair Dealer, I may take it for granted that he doth not equivocate in the word *Condition*, taking it for a mere *Phyſical Qualification*, called a *Condition* or *Preparation*, in another ſenſe than ours; but that we are ſtill ſpeaking of a *Condition in ſenſu Civili, Legali, vel Morali:* Not as the Dryneſs of the Wood, or the Application of it to the Fire, is called a Condition of its Burning; nor as the valiant Mind of Souldiers

is

is a Condition of their valiant Fighting and Conquering, not impoſed by the General, but naturally neceſſary by way of Qualification or Enablement: but it is a Condition conſtituted by a Promiſe, Law, Covenant, or Teſtament that we are ſpeaking of. 1. I ſo explained my Mind fully. 2. The ſubject-Matter of our Diſpute will be on no other ſenſed Condition; ſo that I may well take it for granted, that we are agreed in this, and that Mr. *C.* will not ſeek any Evaſion by an Equivocation in this word.

And then the Caſe is paſt queſtion; for every Condition is a *Condition of Right*, which I prove thus.

It is a Condition of that which the Promiſe giveth: But it is Right (to Salvation) which the Promiſe giveth; Therefore it is a Condition of Right (to Salvation). The Major is paſt diſpute; it being the Condition of a Promiſe, and a part of that Promiſe, and its Office, to ſuſpend the efficacy of the Promiſe or Donative Act. The Minor is as far paſt diſpute with all that know, that the proper product of Laws, Covenants, Promiſes, *&c.* is Right or Dueneſs. The Promiſe gives nothing elſe immediately and naturally but Right. As Sanctification, Glorification, Health, Riches, or any benefit not relative; the Promiſe gives but Right to them, (though it be called a giving the thing it ſelf morally, becauſe God doth infallibly fulfil his Promiſe): But it is by actual natural Cauſation that the thing it ſelf muſt be after given or conveyed. Therefore ſeeing we ſpeak not of a Condition in a Phyſical ſenſe, (as Eating is a Condition of Living) but in a moral, or civil, or judiciary

ciary ſenſe; it is paſt doubt that it's eſſential to a *Condition* to have a reſpect to *Right*, and to be *Conditio juris, vel obtinendi, vel retinendi.*

And if the Aſſertors of the contrary be called to prove their diſtinction from the Scripture, you ſhould ſee on what arbitrary Affirmations and Inventions of their own, ſuch Doctrines are built. For inſtance, when it is promiſed, *Mark* 16. 16. That, *He that believeth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved*]. And *Rom.* 10. *Whoſoever ſhall call on the Name of the Lord ſhall be ſaved*]. And *Heb.* 5. 9. *He became the Author of Eternal Salvation to all them that obey him*]. Prove now by ſuch evidence as ſhould move an impartial Man, that *Believing* only in the firſt Promiſe, and ſuch other is *Conditio juris*; and that, [*Calling on the Name of the Lord, and obeying*] are not *Conditiones juris, vel obtinendi, vel retinendi*: That *Faith* only is a Condition in a judiciary ſenſe, and Repentance, Love to God and Obedience are only Phyſically Conditions, or are Conditions of *Salvation*, but not of *Right* to Salvation: Prove that in the ſame Text, *Joh.* 16. 27. Faith is made a Condition of Right to God's Love, and Love to Chriſt is made a Condition of his Love, but not of Right to it; [*For the Father himſelf loveth you, becauſe ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God*]. Is here either reaſon or room for your diſtinction? [*Becauſe*] is equally added to both, what-ever kind of Condition they are. The Text ſaith expreſly, [*Bleſſed are they that do his Commandments, that they may have Right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the Gates into the City*]. And can you prove that by *Right* here is not meant *Right?*

And

And again obſerve that *Right* to Salvation, and Right to Juſtification at Judgment, are not, yea, cannot be denyed to have the ſame Conditions: For that which juſtifieth our *Cauſe*, will juſtifie us: But that which proveth our Right to Salvation, juſtifieth our Cauſe: For our Right to Salvation, is our Cauſe it ſelf to be then judged.

The Seventh Controverſie is, *Whether the words of the Goſpel-Promiſe or Grant, forgiving ſin, be properly a Sentence of Abſolution by God as Judg? Or rather an Act of Oblivion or Donation of Pardon and Life by God, partly as Benefactor, and partly as Rector, by Law and Guilt? Whether it be a Judicial Sentence only Virtually or Actually?* Mr. *C.* holdeth, that the words of the Goſpel, [He that believeth ſhall be juſtified and ſaved]; are *an actual ſentence of God as Judg:* I hold that it is but *an Act of Oblivion or Condonation*, and *a Gift of Life by God as Legiſlator* and *Benefactor*, and ſo but a *Virtual Sentence.*

But firſt let it be noted, That all this is but a Controverſie *de nomine*, and not *de re.* As long as we are agreed what this Act of Oblivion is, and what it doth, I take it to be a matter of no great moment, whether it be *de nomine*, to be called a *Sentence of Judgment*, properly or improperly. But my Reaſons are theſe.

1. This Goſpel-Act is called by the name of a Law, both in Propheſies, and in the words of the Goſpel it ſelf, *Iſa.* 2. 3. and 8. 16, 20. & 42. 4. & 51. 4. *Mich.* 4. 2. *Rom.* 3. 27. *Gal.* 6. 2. *Heb.* 7. 12. *Jam.* 11. 25. & 2. 8, 12. 1 *John* 3. 4. *Heb.* 8. 10, 16.

2. It is *Norma actionum moralium & norma judicii*: *Ergo*, it is a Law, 1 *John* 2. 5. *Heb.* 4. 2, 3. *Jam.* 1. 22. *John* 12. 47, 48. & 14. 23. & 15. 7. *John* 5. 22, 23. *Jam.* 2. 12. *Rev.* 20. 12, 13. *Matth.* 25. *Joh.* 3. 16, 18, 19.

3. A Day of Judgment is foretold and described in the Gospel, in which a final Sentence will pass on Men according to this Law. *Ergo*, &c. The Law and Sentence are not to be confounded: For they are not all one: The *Norma judicis*, according to which Men must be judged, is not the Judgment it self.

4. A Law is an universal Rule, and the sanction Conditional, and it neither justifieth nor condemneth any antecedently, but only after they have kept or broken it; And then it doth it *ut Lex*, and not *ut sententia judicis*: But a *judicial Sentence* is about particular or individual Persons and Cases; and supposeth a Law kept or broken, and supposeth Accusation, (virtual or actual): and also the particular Cause to be judicially decided, is, Whether the Law condemn or absolve the Person (virtually): Therefore the Law and Sentence are no more to be confounded, than a Lawgiver and a Judg.

5. If it be a Sentence of Judgment, it is a Sentence *secundum normam alicujus Legis*; some Law is the Rule of it: But no Law is the Rule of it; *Ergo*, it is no Sentence of Judgment, properly so called. If any Law be the Rule of it, it is either *an Universal Law made to Mankind*, or a particular Law (as that made to *Noah*, to *Abraham*, to the Jews by *Moses*, &c.) Not the latter: If the former, it must be that called the Law of Nature, and Covenant of Works made to *Adam*, or the

. Law

Law or Covenant of Grace made in Christ: Not the first: For to say, [He that believeth shall be saved], is not to Sentence as Judg according to the Law, [In the day that thou sinnest thou shalt die]. Not the latter; for then the Law and the Judgment were all one; and to say, [He that believeth shall be saved], would be all one as to say, [*John* or *Peter* hath right to Salvation according to the Promise, because they are true Believers]. He that is not satisfied with thus much, let him think as he list, for I shall trouble the Reader with no more.

The Eighth Controversie is, *Whether the judgment of Christ upon Believers after this Life, be not properly a justifying Sentence?* I affirm it, and Mr. *C.* denyeth it, and taketh it to be only a *Declaration of our Justification which we had in this Life.*

Every *judicial Sentence*, is a *Declaration*; but every *Declaration* is not a *judicial Sentence*. This Question therefore is not, Whether it be a *Declaration*, but whether it be not such a Declaration as is a *Sentence of the Judg* in Judgment? And if so, Whether it be not a *proper Justification*, (though here also I know, according to his meaning, the Question is but *de nomine*).

1. That is a proper Sentence of Judgment, which is the publick Declaration and Decision of the *Judg*, to put our Right to Salvation out of Controversie, against all Accusers, and to give us our *Jus Judicatum*, by determining of our *Jus Constituturi*; and this as an orderly means to our full possession. But such will be *Christ's Sentence* at

the Last Judgment; *Ergo*, it will be properly a Judicial Sentence.

2. The Scripture doth most exactly describe it as a *proper Judgment*; It calleth it the Act of Christ as Judg; It calleth it a Judgment: It describeth the Cause, the Persons, the Plea, the Evidence, and the Sentence; 1 *Pet.* 4. 5. 2 *Tim.* 4. 1. *Acts* 17. 31. *John* 5. 22, 24, 26, 27. *Rev.* 20. 12, 13. 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. 1 *Pet.* 1. 17. *Luk.* 10. 14. *Heb.* 6. 2. & 9. 27. *Eccles.* 12. 14. & 11. 9. *Rom.* 14. 10. 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. *Matth.* 25. throughout.

2. It is an Article of our Creed, That Christ shall come again to judg the quick and the dead; and among Christians past dispute. And if he *judg*, he *sentenceth* as Judg. And if he sentence as Judg, it is either a *Sentence* of *Justification*, or of *Condemnation*: All Judgment which is the *genus*, is found in one of these *special Acts*; There is no middle. It is a Judgment of *Condemnation* or of *Justification*. If the *Name* be questioned, I appeal to all Lawyers, all Men that live in Civil Societies, and all Divines; especially Protestants, who maintain against the Papists, that the word *Justifie* is most commonly taken in the New Testament in a *judiciary Sense*, for either the *Sentence* of a *Judg*, or the Plea of an Advocate at Judgment. I think this Controversie needeth no more words. And if I should here cite an hundred Divines that call this Last Judgment by the name of a *Sentence* of *Justification* or *Condemnation*, I should merit nothing of the Reader, but rebuke for troubling him with unnecessary words.

And

And now having reviewed all that I find remaining Controverted, between this Learned, Reverend and Pious Brother and my self, about the Matter which he thought meet to Animadvert on, (or at least all that is worth the Reader's notice). I am glad that our Differences are brought into so narrow a room; and that it is very doubtful whether every one of them be not only *de nomine*: And I think it but a needless trouble to the Reader, to answer all his numerous Citations out of *Amesius*, *Piscator*, *Paræus*, *Zanchy*, *Calvin*, *Davenant*, &c. and such late Divines, which make up the main Body of his Reply; Nor to make so tedious an enquiry, Whether he or I do best understand those Writers Sense: The Controversies themselves being cleared, I have done. And my design is but this;

1. To perswade Divines not to make God's Servants believe that they differ in great and weighty Matters, and so to render them unfit for each others Love and Communion, when they differ but in *Words* and *Logical Notions*.

2. To perswade Men to suffer their Brethren peaceably to rest in *that Truth*, and those *Expressions* of it, which are found in *Scripture*, and the *Church Universal* for above a *thousand years rested in*, and not make *Humane Notions* seem necessary to our Salvation and Church-Communion: Nor in a siding Humour to set the Phrases of some late honoured Divines, against Scripture and the Universal Church, and then to make them Engines of destruction, by making them seem needful Truths, which are but new incongruous Notions, which must at last be attacqued, to force them to confess that their meaning is the same with that which others long have taught.

Post-

POSTSCRIPT.

I Muſt intreat the Reader, when he judgeth of the Second Caſe, (about the Intereſt of *Works* with Faith, in our Title to Life) to remember, That the Queſtion is not;

1. About Works of Innocency.

2. Nor Works of the Moſaical Law.

3. Nor Works meriting of God by their worth, in point of Commutative Juſtice, (or the foreſaid governing Legal Juſtice.)

4. Nor of any Acts of Obedience to Chriſt as Chriſt as antecedent to Faith and Juſtification.

5. Nor of External good Works of Charity, as antecedent to Faith, or to our firſt Juſtification.

6. Nor any Works, to which is given the leaſt part of that which is proper to God, to Chriſt, to the Spirit, to the Promiſe.

But I muſt intreat him to ſee the Caſe ſtated in the Preface to my Diſputations of Juſtification, and to remember that thoſe that I oppoſe do hold;

1. That Faith it ſelf, as an Act of ours, is part of the Works to be denied as a Means or Condition of our Juſtification, and ſo a part of that Subordinate Righteouſneſs, and that we are juſtified by it only as an Inſtrument.

2. They ſay, That he ſeeks the prohibited Juſtification by Works, who looketh to be juſtified by be-

believing in Chriſt as Teacher, King, or any Act of Faith beſides the receiving his Righteouſneſs.

3. Much more he that thinketh Repentance, Love to Chriſt, Deſire of him, Prayer for Pardon, *&c.* or any other Act of Man, is a Means or Condition of our Juſtification or Pardon: To be juſtified by any ſuch Act but as part of the Condition, is to be juſtified by Works.

4. Much more to make ſincere Obedience the Condition of Continued or Final Juſtification in Judgment. See the reſt of the Controverſies in the aforecited Preface and Books. And alſo in my *Pacification* or *Catholick Theology*, where this Cauſe is handled poſitively and defenſively: And he that blameth me for writing ſo many Books of the ſame thing, ſhould be one that firſt conſidereth how many Books and daily Invectives and Cenſures of Men that never underſtood the Cauſe, have called me to it, and made it neceſſary. Four or five Divines roſe in *Holland*, eſpecially at *Frankera*, (notwithſtanding the excellent *Ameſius* his better endeavours) who have owned ill Definitions of God's Covenants, and laid the Foundations of Antinomian Libertiniſm, (eſpecially *Maccovius*, and *Cluto*, and *Cocceius*, and *Cloppenburgius* too much conſented) making the Covenant in Conſtitution to be nothing but Election by Eternal Decree, and the Covenant in Execution, to be the fulfilling or execution of that Decree of Election in all our Mercies; and Juſtification to be but God's eternal Decree, and Man's Juſtification in *Conſcience*, and before Men, with other ſuch confounding Notions; when verily the better Deſcription of God's King-

Kingdom, Laws, and Covenants ſhould be in our Childrens Catechiſm; and ſhould not be unknown to Learned Men; nor ſhould they thus learnedly poſſeſs many honeſt godly (but not long and througly ſtudying) Miniſters, with ſuch Notions which corrupt their *Conceptions*, their Charity, their Sermons, and their Converſe as hinderances of Truth, Piety, Love, and Peace.

FINIS.

A POSTSCRIPT ABOUT Mr. *DANVERS*'s Laſt BOOK.

WHen this Book was coming out of the Preſs, I received another Book of Mr. *Danvers* againſt Infants Baptiſm, in which he mentioneth Dr. *Tullies proving* what a *Papiſt* I am, in his *Juſtif. Paul.* (with Dr. *Pierces* former Charges) and lamenting that no more yet but *one Dr. Tully* hath *come forth to Encounter me*, Epiſt. and Pag. 224. The peruſal of that Book (with Mr. *Tombs ſhort Reflections*) directeth me to ſay but this inſtead of any further Confutation.

That it is (as the former) ſo full of falſe Allegations ſet off with the greateſt Audacity (even a few Lines of my own about our meeting at Saint *James*'s left with the Clerk, groſly falſified) and former falſifications partly juſtified, and partly paſt over, and his moſt paſſionate Charges ground-

ed upon Miſtakes, and managed by Miſreports, ſometime of *Words*, ſometime of the *Senſe*, and ſomerime of *Matters* of *Fact*; in ſhort, it is ſuch a bundle of *Miſtake*, *Fiercenes* and *Confidence*, that I take it for too *uſeleſs* and *unpleaſant* a Work to give the World a particular Detection of theſe Evils. If I had ſo little to do with my Time as to write it, I ſuppoſe that few would find leiſure to read it: And I deſire no more of the willing Reader, then ſeriouſly to peruſe my Book (*More Reaſons for Infants Church-membership*) with his, and to examine the Authors about whoſe Words or Senſe we differ. Or if any would be Informed at a cheaper rate, he may read Mr. *Barrets* Fifty *Queries* in two ſheets. And if Mr. *Tombes* revile me, for not tranſcribing or anſwering more of his *Great Book*, when I tell the Reader that I *ſuppoſe him to have the Book before him*, and am not bound to tranſcribe ſuch a Volume already in Print, and that I anſwer as much as I think needs an Anſwer, leaving the reſt as I found it to the Judgment of each Reader, he may himſelf take this for a *Reply*; but I muſt judg of it as it is.

I find but one thing in the Book that needeth any other Anſwer, than to peruſe what is already Written: And that is about Baptizing Naked: My Book was written 1649. A *little before*, *common uncontrolled Fame was*, that not *far from us* in *one place many of them* were *Baptized naked*, reproving the Cloathing way as Antiſcriptural: I never heard Man deny this Report: I converſed with divers of Mr. *Tombes*'s Church, who denied it not: As never any denied it *to me*, ſo I never *read* one that did deny it to my knowledg: He now tells me Mr. *Fiſher*,

Fiſher, Mr. *Haggar*, and Mr. *Tombes* did: Let any Man read Mr. *Tombes* Anſwer to me, yea and that Paſſage by him now cited, and ſee whether there be a word of denial: Mr. *Fiſher* or *Haggar* I never ſaw: Their Books I had ſeen, but never read two Leaves to my remembrance of Mr. *Fiſhers*, though I numbered it with thoſe that were written on that Subject, as well I might: I knew his Education and his Friends, and I ſaw the Great Volume before he turned *Quaker*, but I thought it enough to read Mr. *Tombes* and others that wrote before him, but I read not him, nor all Mr. *Haggars*: If I had, I had not taken them for competent Judges of a fact *far from them*, and that *three years* after: Could they ſay, that *no one ever did ſo?* The truth is that three years after, miſtaking my words, as if I had affirmed it to be *their ordinary practice* (as you may read in them) which I never did, nor thought, they vehemently deny this: (And ſuch *heedleſs reading* occaſioneth many of Mr. *Danvers* Accuſations). I never ſaid that *no Man ever denied it*; for I have not read *all that ever was written*, nor ſpoken with all the World: But *no Man ever denied it to me*, nor did I *ever read any that denied it*. And in a matter of Fact, if that Fame be not credible, which is of things *Late* and *Near*, and not *Contradicted* by *any one* of the *moſt intereſſed Perſons themſelves*, no not by Mr. *Tombes* himſelf, we muſt ſurceaſe humane Converſe: Yet do I not thence undertake that the ſame was true, either of *thoſe Perſons*, or ſuch as other Writers beyond Sea have ſaid it off. I *ſaw not* any one Baptized by Mr. *Tombes* or any other in *River* or elſewhere by *Dipping at Age*: If you *do no ſuch thing*,

I am ſorry that I believed it, and will recant it. Had *I not ſeen* a *Quaker* go naked through *Worceſter* at the Aſſizes, and read the *Ranters* Letters full of Oathes, I could have proved neither of them. And yet I know not where ſo long after to find my Witneſſes: I abhor Slanders, and receiving ill Reports unwarrantably: I well know that this is not their ordinary Practice: The *Quakers* do not thoſe things now, which many did at the riſing of the Sect; and if I could, I would believe they never did them.

2. This Book of Mr. *Danvers*, with the reſt of the ſame kind, increaſe my hatred of the *Diſputing Contentious* way of writing, and my trouble that the Cauſe of the *Church* and *Truth* hath ſo oft put on me a neceſſity to write in a Diſputing way, againſt the Writings of ſo many Aſſailants.

3. It increaſeth my Grief for the Caſe of Mankind, yea of well-meaning godly Chriſtians, who are unable to judg of many Controverſies agitated, otherwiſe than by ſome Glimpſes of poor Probability, and the eſteem which they have of the Perſons which do manage them, and indeed take their Opinions upon truſt from thoſe whom they moſt reverence and value; and yet can ſo hardly know whom to follow, whilſt the groſſeſt Miſtakes are ſet off with as great confidence and holy pretence, as the greateſt Truths. O how much ſhould Chriſtians be pitied, that muſt go through ſo great Temptations!

4. It increaſeth my Reſolution, had I longer to live, to converſe with Men that I would *profit*, or *profit* by, either as a *Learner* hearing what they *have* to ſay, without importunate Contradiction, or as a *Teacher* if they deſire to Learn of me: A *School* way

way may do ſomething to increaſe Knowledg; but *drenching Men*, and *ſtriving* with them, doth but ſet them on a fiercer ſtriving againſt the Truth: And when they that have need of ſeven and ſeven years Schooling more, under ſome clear well ſtudied Teacher, are made Teachers themſelves, and then turned looſe into the World (as *Sampſons* Foxes) to militate *for* and *with* their *Ignorance*, what muſt the Church ſuffer by ſuch Contenders?

5. It increaſeth my diſlike of that Sectarian dividing hurtful Zeal, which is deſcribed *James* 3. and abateth *my* wonder at the rage of Perſecutors: For I ſee that the ſame Spirit maketh the ſame kind of Men, even when they moſt cry out againſt Perſecutors, and ſeparate furtheſt from them.

6. It reſolveth me more to enquire leſs after the Anſwers to Mens *Books* than I have done: And I ſhall hereafter think never the worſe of a Mans writings, for hearing that they are anſwered: For I ſee it is not only eaſie for a *Talking Man* to *talk on*, and to *ſay ſomething for* or *againſt any thing*, but it is *hard* for them to *do otherwiſe*, even to hold their *Tongues*, or *Pens*, or *Peace*: And when I change this Mind, I muſt give the greateſt *belief* to *Women* that will talk moſt, or to them that *live longeſt*, and ſo are like to have the laſt word, or to them that can train up militant Heirs and Succeſſors to defend them when they are dead, and ſo propagate the Contention. If a ſober Conſideration of the firſt and ſecond writing (yea of *poſitive Principles*) will not inform me, I ſhall have little hope to be much the wiſer for all the reſt.

7. I am fully ſatisfied that even good Men are here ſo far from Perfection, that they muſt bear with

with odious faults and injuries in one another, and be habituated to a ready and eaſie forbearing and forgiving one another. I will not ſo much as deſcribe or denominate Mr. *Danvers* Citations of Dr. *Pierce*, to prove my Popery and Crimes, nor his paſſages about the Wars, and about my Changes, Self-contradictions, and Repentances, leſt I do that which ſavoureth not of Forgiveneſs: O what need have we all of Divine Forgiveneſs!

8. I ſhall yet leſs believe what any Mans *Opinion* (yea or Practice) is by his *Adverſaries Sayings, Collections, Citations*, or moſt vehement Aſſeverations, than ever I have done, though the Reporters pretend to never ſo much Truth, and pious Zeal.

9. I ſhall leſs truſt a *confounding ignorant* Reader or Writer, that hath not an accurate *defining* and *diſtinguiſhing* Underſtanding, and hath not a *mature, exerciſed, diſcerning* Knowledg than ever I have done; and eſpecially if he be engaged in a *Sect* (which alas, how few parts of the Chriſtian World eſcape!) For I here (and in many others) ſee, that you have no way to ſeem Orthodox with ſuch, but to run quite into the contrary Extream: And if I write againſt both Extreams, I am taken by ſuch Men as this, but to be *for both and againſt both*, and to *contradict my ſelf*. When I write againſt the Perſecutors, I am one of the Sectaries, and when I write againſt the Sectaries, I am of the Perſecutors ſide: If I belie not the Prelatiſts, I am a Conformiſt: If I belie not the *Anabaptiſts, Independants*, &c. I am one of them: If I belie not the Papiſts, I am a Papiſt; if I belie not the *Arminians*, I am an *Arminian*; if I belie not the *Calviniſts*

viniſts, I am with *Pſeudo-Tilenus* and his Brother, *purus putus* Puritanus, and one *Qui totum Puritaniſmum totus ſpirat* (which *Joſeph Allen* too kindly interpreteth): If *I* be for *lawful Epiſcopacy*, and *lawful Liturgies* and *Circumſtances* of *Worſhip*, I am a *temporizing Conformiſt*: If *I* be for *no more*, I am an intollerable Non-Conformiſt (at this time forced to part with Houſe, and Goods, and Library, and all ſave my Clothes, and to poſſeſs nothing, and yet my Death (by ſix months Impriſonment in the Common Goal) is ſought after and continually expected. If *I* be as very *a Fool*, and as *little underſtand my ſelf*, and as much *contradict my ſelf*, as all theſe Confounders and Men of Violence would have the World believe, it is much to *my coſt*, being hated by them all while I ſeek but for the common peace.

10. But I have alſo further learned hence to *take up my content in Gods Approbation*, and (having done my duty, and pitying their own and the Peoples ſnares) to make but ſmall account of all the Reproaches of all ſorts of Sectaries; what they will ſay againſt me living or dead, I leave to themſelves and God, and ſhall not to pleaſe a Cenſorious Sect, or any Men whatever, be falſe to my Conſcience and the Truth: If the Cauſe I defend be not of God, I deſire it may fall: If it be, I leave it to God how far He will proſper it, and what Men ſhall think or ſay of me: And I will pray for Peace to him that will not hate and revile me for ſo doing. Farewell.

Septemb. 4. 1675.

FINIS.